

THE
CLASSICAL JOURNAL:

FOR

MARCH AND JUNE, 1820.

VOL. XXI.

ὦ φίλος, εἰ σοφὸς εἶ, λήρῃ μ' ἐς χέρας· εἰ δέ γε πᾶμπαν
Νῆϊς ἔφους Μουσέων, ῥίψον ἂ μὴ νοέεις.

EPIG. INCERT.

T

London:

PRINTED BY A. J. VALPY,

RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET;

SOLD BY

LONGMAN, HURST, REES, ORME, AND BROWN; F. C. AND
J. RIVINGTONS; SHERWOOD AND CO., PATERNOSTER
ROW; PARKER, OXFORD; BARRETT, CAM-
BRIDGE; MACREDIE AND CO., EDIN-
BURGH; CUMMING, DUBLIN; AND
ALL OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

1820.

ERRATA ET CORRIGENDA

XXXVII p. 168, l. 6, read *edon*.

XXXIX = 70 = 12,-- *divine* + *relative*.

TO THE BINDER.

As the INDEX to the first 20 Volumes or first 40 Numbers will not appear till the 1st of July, do not bind Vol. XX till then.

CONTENTS OF NO. XLI.



	PAGE
Mystical Poetry of the Persians	1
Oxford Prize Poem By the Hon. Mr STANLEY. <i>Syllabus</i>	3
Remarks on the Pyramid of Cephreus lately opened by Mr. Belzoni. By GEORGE STANLEY FABER, B.D. Rector of Long Newton	8
Miscellanea Classica, No. VIII.	22
An Inquiry into the Opinions of the Ancient Hebrews, respecting a future immortal Existence. By the Rev. D. G. WAITE	29
Arabian Story	33
On the Science of the Egyptians and Chaldeans. Part VIII. By the R ^{ts} Hon. Sir W. DRUMMOND	35
Commentary on the Description of Ardent Fever given by ARFELUS. Part II.	57
Letters on the Ancient British Language of Cornwall. No. VI.	62

	PAGE.
BIBLIOGRAPHY. List of the principal Books of the Duke of Marlborough's Collection at White Knights, sold by Mr. Evans, Pall Mall, in June, 1819. With prices and purchasers. Part II.	68
Dissertation Historique, Littéraire et Bibliographique, sur la Vie et les Ouvrages de MACROBE. No. II. Par M. ALPHONSE MAHUL.	81
Observations on the Critique in the Quarterly Review on the new Edition of Stephens' Greek Thesaurus	90
Corrections in the Text of Wakefield's Lucretius	102
Greek Ode	113
On the Pretensions of Laurens Koeter, of Haarlem, to the Invention of Printing with Movable Types. By Professor NOEHDEN	117
Parallel Passages. By the Rev. J. SEAGER	137
ADVERSARIA LITERARIA. No. XXIII.—Joannis Bapt. Bolla lambi in Pantomimam Viganò.—Important Ad- ditions to the First Alcibiades, and Timæus of Plato. —Ad venerandum virum, Ricardum Busby: <i>Ficta sunt proxima veris</i> , à R. Freund.—De Cometa qui, an. 1819, ipsis improvisus Astronomis, apparuit	141
On the Origin of the Heathen Mythology. By JOHN BELLAMY	148
Stanleii Note quædam in Callimachum	162
Literary Intelligence	166
Notes to Correspondents	187

CONTENTS OF NO. XLII.



	PAGE.
On the Instruction and Civilisation of Modern Greece.	
Professor NOERREN	189
Remarks on a Hieroglyphic which Dr. Clarke terms a	
Horse's Head	198
Platonic Demonstration of the Immortality of the Soul ..	201
On the Origin of the Drama	230
Ancient British Language of Cornwall. Lett. X.	238
Translation and Observations on an Ode of Horace.	
R. HOBLYN	248
Some Emendations on Aristotle. Rev. J. SEAGER ..	252
Cambridge Prize Latin Essay, 1802.	254
Important Discovery of the Original of many of the Sen-	
tuences of Sextus Pythagoricus, which have been hitherto	
supposed to be alone extant in the fraudulent version of	
the Presbyter Ruffinus. T. TAYLOR	266
Notice of Researches in Greece; by William Martin-Leake	270
Miscellanea Classica, No. 18.	276
Corrections in the common Translation of the New Testa-	
ment. No. 7.	280
Notice of Dr. Symmons's Translation of the Æneis of	
Virgil	286

On the Interpretation of Aristotle's famous Definition of Tragedy	292
Oxford Prize Poem for 1806:— <i>Trafalgar</i>	295
Cursory Observations on a Translation of the Arabic MS. describing the death of MUNGO PARK, by Mr. ABRAHAM SALAME, inserted in an account of a Mission to Ashantee, by T. E. Bowdich, Esq.: occasioned by reflections made in the Quarterly Review, No. xlv. on another Translation of the same MS. by JAMES GREY JACKSON	299
Bibliography:—the White Knights Library, Part II. &c.	307
On the Origin, Progress, Prevalence, and Decline of Idolatry. By the Rev. GEORGE TOWNSEND	320
Remarks on a Criticism on Mr. Bellamy's new Translation of the Bible	331
Illustration of Jonah ii, 2.	337
<i>ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΟΥ ΜΕΔΕΑ</i> . Euripidis Medea. In usum studiosæ Juventutis recensuit et illustravit PETRUS ELMSLEY, A. M. No. II.	338
Letter to Dr. Lee on the author's New Translation of the Scriptures, by JOHN BELLAMY	358
Adversaria Literaria, No. XXIV.—Discovery of a verse of Homer, and Error of Kiessling— <i>Ad popularem hydram</i> ,—Hebrew Elegiac Ode, on the Death of King George III.—Latin Inscription to Prince Blucher—Latin version of a Commandment	361
Notice of DOBREE's <i>Porsoni Aristophanica</i>	365
Literary Intelligence	372
Notes to Correspondents	378



THE

CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

Nº. XLI.

MARCH, 1820.

MYSTICAL POETRY OF THE PERSIANS.

OF two Persian Odes, praising God in the extraordinary language of the *Sufi* sect, a French translation in manuscript lately fell into my hands. The original author was *Aga Seid Ahmed*, of Ispahan; and the ingenious translator, Monsieur Jouannin, first interpreter to the late embassy at the Persian court, under General De Gardane. As these poems are not only of indisputable authenticity, but very excellent specimens of that mysticism so prevalent among the Persians, they seem not unworthy of a place in the *Classical Journal*, which occasionally devotes some of its valuable pages to communications on the subject of oriental literature. They will be found to illustrate, in a remarkable degree, Sir William Jones's admirable discourse "On the Mystical Poetry of the Persians and Indians," (*Asiat. Researches*, Vol. iii.) which almost wholly consists of a religious allegory, figuratively expressing the fervor of devotion, or the ardent love of created spirits toward their beneficent Creator; "though it seems," says he, "to contain only the sentiments of a wild and voluptuous libertinism." In the vocabulary of the *Sufi* poets, Sir William observes, *wine* invariably signifies devotion; *sleep* is explained by meditation on the divine perfections; *perfume* by hope of the divine favor; *kisses* and *embraces* are the raptures of piety; *idolaters*, *infidels*, and *libertines*, are men of the purest religion; and their *idol* is the Creator himself; the *tavern* is an oratory; *beauty* the perfection of the Supreme Being; *wantonness*, *mirth*, and *incontinency*, mean religious ardor and abstraction from all terrestrial thoughts. By means of

2 *Mystical Poetry of the Persians.*

this vocabulary, many sonnets of *Háfiz*, which, to the uninitiated, appear merely *Anacreontic*, amorous, or *bacchanalian*, may be interpreted into sublime effusions of enthusiastic devotion. In the two following poems, *Seid Ahmed*, with the true spirit of a *Súfi*, regards the fire-worshippers and Christians as only paying homage under different forms of worship, to the same great and sole Divinity ; whilst, by the common *Muselmáns* they are regarded as absolute pagans and idolaters. In that great and sole Divinity, whom M. Jouannin's translation entitles *Ychowa*, we instantly recognise the Almighty, "Jehovah, Jove, or Lord!" D. V.

ODE 1.

O Thou, for whom my heart and my life incessantly offer themselves as a willing sacrifice ! allow my soul to pour itself out at thy feet. How difficult is it to withdraw our hearts from thy power ! how easy to sacrifice our lives on thy footsteps ! The road which leads to thee is replete with difficulties : the evil of loving thy beauty is an evil without remedy. Behold thy slaves ! they offer thee their hearts and souls : their eyes are fixed on thy movements ; their ears are attentive to thy commands. Dost thou desire peace ? behold our hearts. Dost thou wish for war ? here are our lives. Last night I wandered about on every side, filled with anxiety and glowing with love. At length the ardour which consumed me, directed my attention to the temple of the Magi. Remote from profane eyes, I beheld a lonesome place, resplendent from divine light, but not from waxen torches. I saw, all around, that heavenly fire which Moses, the son of Amran, beheld on Mount Sinai. In that temple, an aged personage excited the sacred flame ; and about the venerable man were arranged the young disciples, all of blooming complexions, all with vermilion lips, uttering soft language. There might have been heard the sounds of guitars, harps, flutes, and tabours. There were delicious fruits and nectar, roses, and a thousand other flowers. A youth of dazzling beauty, his curling ringlets fragrant with exquisite perfumes, poured out the nectar ; meanwhile a sweet singer exerted his voice in melodious strains. The youths and the priests surrounded their venerable chief, whilst I, concealed in a corner of the temple, blushed at being a *Muselmán*. The aged pontiff asked "Who is this stranger ?" I answered, "I am a lover, bewildered and forlorn." "Give to this guest," said the old man, "give him, although unwitted, some of the purest wine." The fire-worshipping cup bearer poured out a consuming fire : I emptied the cup, and instantly all traces of religion vanished. I fell intoxicated ; and in my delirium heard an unknown language which cannot be described ; but it expressed in words which every member of my frame repeated, and which thrilled in every vein—"Yes, he is alone—he only exists : *Ychowa* is alone ; there is none other but he !"

ODE 2.

O my beloved! never will I break the ties which attach me to thee, even though the edge of the sword should divide me into pieces. Surely a thousand lives would but cheaply purchase one half-smile of thy sweet mouth. O my father, no longer advise me on the subject of my love! no longer reckon on thy son—he is distracted. Well do I know the path that leads to the palace of happiness: but what can I do? Behold, I am in chains. One day, in a church, I said to a lovely Christian, “O thou who hast captivated my heart, who bindest me with the threads of thy sacred girdle, when wilt thou discover the true path of Unity? Wilt thou not renounce with shame the doctrine of a Trinity in one, sole Person? How canst thou believe that the Eternal can have divided himself into Father, Son, and Holy Ghost?” She opened her sweet lips, and replied, with a fascinating smile, in these charming words: “If thou hadst possessed the secret of the Unity of God, thou wouldst not have accused me of infidelity. The beloved *Almighty*, can he not at once reflect on three mirrors the brilliant rays of his divine countenance? Does silk change its nature when thou callest it by different names, satin, purple, and velvet?” Such was her discourse, when I heard an awful voice proceeding from the bells of the church, and pronouncing, “Yes! he is alone—he alone exists—*Yehowa* is the only God!”

 OXFORD PRIZE POEM.

 BY THE HON. MR. STANLEY.

SYRACUSE.

PROPTER floriferi consuetum flumen Anapi,
 Dilectæque Hyblæ per dulcia rura, tacetis,
 Sicelides Musæ? nullumne Arethusa Camœnam
 Servat adhuc; vitreo quam sæpe Theocritus antro
 Nectenteinque moras, et molli carmine captam
 Detinuit, vespuitque freti miscerier undis!
 O si suave dolens lugubri Moschus avena
 Funereum cantu patriæ decus adderet urbi!
 Jam nulla Aoniûm in sacris vestigia lucis
 Apparent, mutique lacus, et Dorica Tempe
 Pierios testata motos: quin occidit omnis
 Gloria Trinacriæ: jacet urbs, quæ fertur Athenis
 Hand impar congressa; jacet, quæ nacta tridentis
 Imperium, terræque potens, sua jura volentes

Per populos dabat; angusto nunc limite saxum
 Continet Ortygiæ, squalorque inhonestus obuanbrat.
 Non sic fatidicus ventura canebat Apollo,
 Tunc enim divitiis inhians, et iniqua Syracæ
 Stagna nihil metuens, nullo munita labore
 Conditor exiguae fundamina poneret urbis;
 Parva quidem, sed tuta loco; nam plurima findit
 In latos sese nuda sinus, duplicesque recessus.
 Fertur et ipsa novis Pallas risisse cologis:
 Palladis auratæ primum per templa columnæ
 Ad soem fulsere; Dea hinc præsentior urbem
 Enitique dedit paulatim, et viribus auctis
 Crescere; dum sensim per terram brachia tendens,
 Quatuor amplexa est, a ventis quatuor, arces.
 Tum belli tentare vices, ultroque propinquas
 Sollicitare armis gentes; tum fœdere victos
 Accipere, et lætæ commercia jungere pacis.
 Vosque, Syracusas, haud nullo Numine Divum,
 Ad summas vexistis opes, et culmina rerum,
 Illustres Herôum animæ! tu primus ad auras
 Surge, Celo! tibi enim vicinos fata dedere
 Subjicere imperio populos, et Marte secundo
 Pœnorum domuisse acies, patriamque tueri.
 Salve, magne Parens urbis! tibi præmia Virtus
 Fecit propria, et vivos tumulo circumdat honores
 Nec te Musa, Hiero, tanto vix fratre minorem
 Transierit, ni Pindaricis super æthera pœnīs
 Evectum exigua fugerem tenuare Camœna.
 Me, sacra Pieridum nutrix, ante omnia raptat
 Aurea Libertas; illam sancto omniæ lætæ
 Accipiunt gentes; illa adveniente beatus
 Ridet ager, viget artis honos: ea, maxima fovit
 Ingenia, Hermocratemque, et sanguine jura Diocleni
 Urmantem proprio, legesque in morte sacrantem.
 Illa etiam, regnandi avidas, rerumque potentes,
 Sola Syracosio confregit milite Athenas.
 Vos, vacui portus, lateque silentia Thapsi
 Littora, senta situ, famæque oblita vetustæ,
 Vos testor, vidistis enim, quæ prælia vestram
 Tubarint requiem, quantas induxerit agra
 Ambitio strages, geminique insania belli!
 Nunc quoque (Plenihyrio quamvis sub vértice rarus
 Tendit iter, levisque secat maria alta phœchus,
 Et, fidei monumenta, cruces circum ostia fulgent);
 Nunc etiam antiquas videor mihi cernere classes,

Clangoremque haurire tubæ, mixtosque tumultus
Ad pugnam hortantum, et sacrum Parana canentum.
Heu nox illa malis et acerbo fœta dolore,
Cum jam Cecropidum res fractæ; et Læna, labores
Insolitos perpessa, fugæ dare terga vetabat!
Longe alii motus animorum, ubi non sua puppes
Serta coronarunt, et jam clamore secundo
Pendentes velorum alas, Salamine relictæ,
Sicanium lætis operarunt classibus aquor.
Nunc, pro cantu alacri, pro spe, plausuque suorum,
Exercet vigilas effosso in carcere luctus
Insopita fames; quin tela arsere dici
Pestifera, infecitque auras spirabile letum.
Nec tamen has inter strages furiasque triumphæ,
Nullus honor Musis; Gratiæ meminisse Camenæ
Profuit afflictis; teneraque Euripidis arte
Molliti dominorum animi, laxæque catenæ.

Ecce autem invigilans urbi irrequieta Tyrannus
Vincla movet super; et Siculis juga dura minatur.
Cui non Lantimiae, cui non dolus iste barathri
Auditus? Claustumque, et mons excisus in aurem
Dædaleam, infandique auctor Dionysius antri?
Martis amans tamen hic patriæ non defuit urbi;
Auspice non alio, crebra tremefacta bipenni
Piniferis sonat Ætna jugis; Calabraq; fragorem
Dant sylvæ; unde novis navalibus ostia pandens
Thapsus inassuetas miratur surgere classes.

Hinc urbs imperium pelagi, et Mavortis honores
Præripere; hinc princeps torquere rubentia belli
fulmina; succubuit perterrita Naxos, et Etna,
Et Catane victorem, et Troia sensit Acesta.

Nec quamvis seras non accepere catenas
Rhegini grassante fame; cum civibus ipsa
Gramina deficerent, et victus herba negaret.
Quid memorem Motyæ clades, et fortia frustra
Pectola? quid cadem Entellæ, quid Amilcaris arma
Versa retro, et Pæno rorantes sanguine campos.
O modo legitimis animum satiare ferocem
Si spoliis voluisset, et cetera bella movere;
Nec patriæ armasset rabies in viscera dextram!

Exoriare nitor, præclaro digne magistro,
Digne Platone Dion! doctas paulisper Athenas

Desere, felices Academi desere sylvas,
 Rursus¹ et horrendam belli emetire Charyb̄din.
 Te quoque fraterna quamvis de cæde cruentum,
 Timoleon, te labenti succurrere sæclo
 Fata sinunt; nec enim frustra delapsa, verendo
 Crine sedet, spondetque novos sacra² vitta triumphos.
 Eia agite, ultores vos sceptrum immane Tyranni
 Jamdudum vocat, et violatæ injuria gentis
 Ulterius non passa moram. Vos eximet ævo
 Nulla dies. Si quid patriæ pia cura valebit,
 Si quis honor tumuli, longum per sæcula nomen
 Timolonteï servabit gloria Templi.

Felix, auspiciis semper si talibus usa,
 Trinacriæ Regina; nec unquam fraude maligna
 Hippocratis decepta, ultro funesta tulisses
 Prælia, Romanis audax te opponere signis!
 Quid ruis in fatum? quid flavæ spernis aristæ
 Munera? quid Cereri Libyca dilectior ora
 Fastidis pacem, armorumque incendia misces?
 Annibalis victor, spoliisque beatus opimis,
 En tandem Marcellus adest! super æquora victrix
 Longa triumphali sese explicat ordine classis:
 Mille adsunt nova bellorum instrumenta, necisque,
 Cratesque, pluteique: et centum fulta carinis,
 Extans; urbis opus, muro sambuca minatur.

O Sophia, o sanctos dignata recludere fontes
 Doctrinæ, mentemque extra confinia mundi.
 Elatam rapuisse: unus, tua jussa secutus,
 Unus consilium ducis, et Romana moratus
 Agmina, devotæ fortunam distulit urbis!
 Ille etiam cœlique vias, et sidera novit:
 Et vitæ Solis jubar in convexa tabellæ³
 Contrahere, et subitis naves involvere flammis:
 Aut rapere elatas, fractasque illidere saxis.
 At misera extremam falsa inter gaudia noctem
 Urbs agit, effuso⁴ spumant carchesia Baccho,
 Letiferisque vacant epulis. Heu nescia fati
 Mens hominum!—crebro sonat uriete porta, tubarumque
 Horrendos audit strepitus Acradiæ, videtque
 Victrices Aquilas, ipsam intra mœnia Roman.

¹ Dion, ut ait Plato, Syracusas rediit Ὀφρόντης τὴν ὅλην ἀναμετρήσειε Χάρμῳ.

² Plut. Timoleon.

³ Plut. Marcellus, et Liv. 24.

⁴ Liv. 25. 23.

Marcellum interea jam devastata videntem
 Labdala, et immissis ruituras ignibus arces,
 Continuo fati subiit melioris imago,
 Et qualis quanta populus sub clade jaceret;
 “Ergo, ait, hæc Siculi sedes pulcherrima regni
 Occidet, et signis strages ea debita nostris?
 Usque adeone brevi Manes Hieronis ænici
 Spernimus, et junctas nos hæc in fœdera dextras,
 Ut manibus nostris accensæ hæc omnia flammæ
 Diripiant, et sævâ effraeni militis ira?
 Non ita: victorem magni miserebitur hostis,
 Et lauro implicuisse piam laudabor olivam.”
 Talia mente movens rabiem compescere belli
 Gestit, et hac illac studio volat acer honesto:
 Nequicquam; tota fervens dominatur in urbe
 Jamdudum strages; animos furor ebruius urget,
 Et, stimulata mora, sitis irrequieta rapinæ.
 Ecce autem incumbens peraratis pulvere formis,
 Mystica doctrinæ Sapiens, penitusque latentes
 Naturæ totoolvebat pectore leges:
 Infelix, qui non vicina tonitrua belli
 Audierit! capiti impendens sublime coruscat
 Fulmineus mucro: non conscius ille periculi
 Sternitur, inscriptaque jacet revolutus arena.
 Ergo te, patriæ columen, te barbara leto
 Dextra dedit; magnusque cinis tellure jaceres
 Ignota, ni parvam inter dumeta columnam
 Vix humili ornatam sphaera tenuique cylindro
 Inventam Arpinas¹ merito cumulasset honore.
 Tam leve, tam fallax decus est quodcumque sepulchri!
 Heu quianam humanos semper volventia casus
 Fata ruunt in pejus; et alto in cardine rerum
 Pendentes trepidant, bellis vertentibus, urbes?
 Ergo ea legitimis Marcelli crepta tropæis
 Marmora Praxitelis, spirantia signa, supersunt,
 Scilicet et Verres manibus populetur avaris?
 Inque novas venient clades, ut sævior hostis
 Det flammis; ut Romani vigor igneus astri
 Cum deferbuerit, præda latentur opima
 Lutatium Mahumedæ agmen, Turcæque feroces?
 Suave aliquid tamen hæc veteris vestigia gentis,
 Siqua manent; lustrare; et saxo effossa theatra,

Templaque, lapsuramque Jovis venerarier ædem.
 Et juvat inter agros errare ubi; tristia quondam
 Notaque supplicijs loca, nunc florentibus hortis
 Lautumiae¹ rident; infixaque vincula rupi
 Viva tegunt folia, atque ingens oleaster obumbrat.

Felix nunc etiam tellus, si prodiga quantum
 Sparsit opes, largasque sinu Natura profudit
 Delicias, tantum ipsa animis armisque tuorum
 Consuleres famæ! Turgent in collibus uvæ;
 Hybla thymo, ut quondam, redolet; flaventiaque arva
 Non magis averso nutrit Sol aureus igni.
 At genus acre virum, at nullo frangenda labore
 Corda absunt: friget, qui Spiritus intus alebat,
 Libertatis Amor: subitque insana Libido,
 Et furiale Odium, et dissuasor Luxus honesti.
 Nequequam obtusas tibi Gloria personat aures;
 Et sanctum Patriæ nomen: nihil ista morantur
 Degeneres, queis fœda nigra super incubat umbra
 Desidia, enervatque animos, prohibetque nefanda
 Executere imperia, et dominorum erumpere vinclis.

EDUARDUS G. SMITH STANLEY.

1819.

EX AEDR CHRISTI.

REMARKS

*On the PYRAMID of CEPHIRENES, lately opened by
 Mr. BELZONI. By GEORGE STANLEY FABER,
 B. D. Rector of Long-Newton.*

Quidquid sub terra est, in apicem proferet ætas;
 Defodiet condetque nitentia.

Hor. Epist. lib. i. epis. 6. ver. 21, 25.

FEW subjects have occasioned more speculation than the intent and use of the Egyptian pyramids. Respecting these stupendous edifices the common opinion has been, that they were raised as the tombs of certain very ancient sovereigns of the country: and, as this opinion has come down to us through the medium of the Greek writers from very remote antiquity, it has been deemed almost a sort of literary profaneness in any degree to controvert it.

No doubt such an opinion cannot have arisen without some very

¹ Stolberg.

good reason: that is to say, the Greek writers could never have *imagined* the pyramids to be tombs, unless they had been actually informed by the Egyptians that they *were* tombs: Hence we may be tolerably sure, that they *received* this information; though it is very possible that they may have greatly mistaken its *import*.

What they were told by the priesthood, seems to have been this: that *each pyramid was the tomb of a very ancient king of Egypt*. Having received this general account of them, and finding that the three principal ones were ascribed to the three kings, Cheops and Cephrenes and Mycerinus, they naturally enough concluded them to be the sepulchres of these three princes. Their opinion, which seemed to rest upon a very solid foundation, was forthwith committed to writing: and hence originated the general persuasion, that three van-glorious and tyrannical kings had harassed their subjects and had exhausted the wealth of their country for no better purpose, than that they might repose after death in tombs of extraordinary magnitude. The truth of the matter meanwhile was this: each pyramid was indeed a tomb, as the Egyptians had very truly informed the Greeks; each pyramid was likewise the tomb of a reputed very ancient king of the country, as they had no less truly told their inquisitive visitors; but, instead of being the *literal* sepulchres of the *literal* kings of the country, they were each alike the *mystical* sepulchre of Osiris, the supposed primeval king and hero-god of Egypt.

The striking uniformity of Paganism, as established in every part of the world, will lead us, if I mistake not, without much difficulty, to the *rationale* of the pyramids. I have discussed the subject very much at large in my work on *the Origin of Pagan Idolatry*: and, as an author usually feels some degree of parental affection for the offspring of his brain, it has certainly afforded me no small satisfaction to find, that the late curious discovery of Mr. Belzoni has completely established my previously advanced opinion on the subject. That the matter may be the more clearly understood, I shall give a brief statement of the argumentative process, by which I was led to a conclusion now demonstrated to be true by the contents of the long closed pyramid of Cephrenes.

1. As the rudiments of Paganism are the same in all parts of the world, so is there a surprising uniformity in the religious structures of the old idolaters. We are wont familiarly to talk of the pyramids of Egypt, as if pyramids were something peculiar to that country: but the fact is, pyramids of different sizes and proportions and materials are to be found in every quarter of the globe.

1. In no region are they more common than in Hindostan; between which country and Egypt, through the medium of the shepherd-kings, there was a very early and a very close religious connection.

Now the Brahmins, who may be supposed to understand the allowed principles of their own national superstition, are unanimous

in declaring, that *every pyramid is an artificial mountain designedly constructed as a copy of the holy mount Meru*. The earliest of these, they assure us, was raised on the banks of the Euphrates; but they likewise mention three very famous ones in Misraethan, on the banks of the western Nile, or blue river; yet, wherever edifices of this form occur, such edifices are invariably to be deemed imitative copies of the holy mountain. What then are we to understand by *the holy mountain Meru*, which they thus make the prototype of every mountain pyramid? They describe it as the special abode of Iswara; who, during the prevalence of an universal deluge, floated in the ship Argha upon the surface of the interminable ocean: they tell us, that the ship Argha was a form of his mysterious consort Isi; and they contend, that, when the waters of the flood retired, Iswara and Argha were metamorphosed into two doves. Sometimes they relate the same story in a more literal form. In this case, a mighty deluge overflows the whole world; and none escape, save Menu with his seven companions and a select number of all sorts of animals. These are preserved in a vast ark; which at length, when the flood abates, rests upon one of the peaks of mount Meru.

2. Exactly the same account, relative to the design and origin of the great pyramid of Cholula, prevailed among the Mexicans, and still even at the present day prevails among their posterity.

Before the general inundation, the country of Anahuac was inhabited by giants. All those, who did not perish, were transformed into fishes; except seven who fled into a cavern, the cavern no doubt (in plain English) of the ark. When the waters subsided, one of these giants, Xelhua, surnamed *the architect*, went to Cholula; where, as a memorial of the mountain Thyloc, which had served for an asylum to himself and his six brethren, he built an artificial hill in the form of a pyramid. The gods beheld with wrath this edifice, the top of which was to reach the clouds. Irritated at the daring attempt of Xelhua, they hurled fire on the pyramid. Numbers of the workmen perished: the work was discontinued: and the monument was afterwards dedicated to the god of the air.

3. From these concurring accounts it is sufficiently evident, that the holy mountain, of which every pyramid was an avowed transcript, was no other than mount Ararat, upon which the ark rested after the deluge. Each pyramid then was a copy of mount Ararat: whence we must obviously conclude, that the religious notions attached to the pyramid bore a certain relation to the history of the flood.

11. The Hindoo theologians, though they occasionally differ as to the form which they ascribe to the holy mount Meru, very generally represent it as being square as standing with an accurate relation to the four cardinal points of the compass, and as composed of eight successively diminishing towers placed one upon the other.

1. Now, according to Herodotus and Strabo, this was the exact form and arrangement of the tower of Babylon. It was composed, they tell us, of eight successively diminishing towers, piled one upon another: its shape was square or parallelogrammic; it was arranged, with studious reference to the four cardinal points: and each of its four sides presented the aspect of a gigantic flight of eight steps. But this very pyramid, raised on the banks of the Euphrates, was, according to the Hindoo theologians, the earliest montiform edifice which the sons of men reared as a studious copy of mount Meru.

2. I need scarcely remark, that the Mexican legend, attached to the pyramid of Cholula, is plainly nothing more than a corrupted and locally appropriated narrative of the building of the Babylonian tower, doubtless brought away in the first instance from the plain of Shinar by them of the dispersion. Accordingly, the form of this pyramid, like the form of the Babylonian tower, bears ample testimony to the accuracy of the Hindoo declaration, that every pyramid in every part of the world is a designed copy of mount Meru; or, to quit the language of mythology, that every pyramid in every part of the world is a designed copy of mount Ararat. The Cholulan pyramid, which still exists, corresponds both in shape and position with the tower of Babylon, as described by the Greek historians. It is composed of four successively diminishing towers, piled one upon another; and it is constructed with exact relation to the four cardinal points of the compass. The number of steps differs indeed in the two pyramids: but, in the general outline of the form, and in the astronomical arrangement of the parallelogrammic basis, they perfectly agree.

3. As the Cholulan pyramid differs from the Babylonian in having a *smaller* number of steps than eight, so the Egyptian pyramids of Ghiza differ from it in having a *larger* number of steps. In all other respects, they perfectly resemble the tower of Babel: for they are built with a studied reference to the four cardinal points; and the two, which have been opened, contain each a dark central chamber, which answers to the similar chamber mentioned by Herodotus as constructed in the heart of the Babylonian pyramid.

4. On the same principle are built the Indian pyramids of Tanjore, though, in their proportions, they are higher in reference to their base than the pyramids of Ghiza. Each is framed with many steps: each has a dark chamber in the interior: and each is built with a relation to the four cardinal points.

5. The Egyptians however did not always construct their pyramids with many steps: it is worthy of observation, that one of the pyramids of Saccara bears the same close affinity to the Babylonian pyramid as the Cholulan pyramid of Mexico; for it consists of four steps or four square towers piled one upon the other.

6. Of this same pyramidal form, no doubt, were the artificial high-places so frequently mentioned in Holy Writ. *Natural hills*, which were deemed *natural* copies of the holy mountain, were very

frequently used for the purpose of sacrifice : but the zeal of superstition perpetually raised *artificial* hills also or *artificial* high-places, which, when completed, were employed in the same manner. Their form rendered them excellent fortresses : accordingly, the strenuous resistance made by the Mexicans to Cortes and his followers from the great pyramid of their capital city, was but a repetition of what had occurred many centuries before in Palestine, when the men of Jericho retired to the tower or pyramid of Baal-Berith in order to defend themselves against the attack of Abimelech.¹

III. As all these pyramids were equally copies of mount Meru or mount Ararat, and as every natural high-place was still a copy of the same holy mountain, they were each employed as an enormous altar; for, in absolute strictness of speech, though they were the primeval oratories of Patriarchism corrupted into Paganism, they can scarcely be denominated *temples*.

The first postdiluvian sacrifice was offered on the summit of mount Ararat by the great patriarch, who was preserved in the ship. Hence, on every imitative mountain, whether natural or artificial, sacrifices were devoted to that principal hero god : who was said to be the father of three sons ; and who, with seven companions, was reported to have sailed over a shoreless ocean in a wonderful ship, by the Hindoos called *Argha*, and by the Egyptians and the Greeks styled *Argo* or *Baris*. For this purpose, the pyramidal altar was built with a flat top ; which sometimes sustained a sacellum or chapel, and which at other times was left wholly naked. The summit of the chief pyramid of Gihiza, though from the enormous bulk of the fabric it seems a mere point to the eye of the spectator, is yet a square platform of not less than thirty-two feet.

IV. If then each pyramid were a copy of mount Ararat, in what manner originated the belief, that *the pyramids of Egypt were the tombs of the ancient kings of the country* ? or how could the priests inform their Grecian visitors, which yet I have no doubt they did, that *every Egyptian pyramid was the sepulchre of a very ancient king* ?

The answer to this question is readily afforded by the theological system, which prevailed on the banks of the Nile ; though it was the very reverse of being any way *peculiar* to that country.

1. It is well known, that the worship of Osiris or Thammuz was of a mereal nature. In the celebration of his mysteries, the god was first bewailed as one dead : and, after a certain time had been allowed to elapse, his supposed restoration to life was celebrated with the most riotous mirth and the most frantic acclamations. To these rites we have frequent allusions in Scripture : for they prevailed in Palestine, just as much as in Egypt. The women, who wept for Thammuz, bewailed the dead Osiris or Adonis : and,

¹ Judges ix. 46--49.

when the Israelites fell into the idolatry of their neighbours, they are said to have eat the offerings of the dead. These rites are accordingly denominated, by the ancient author of the Orphic Argonautics, *the lamentations of the Egyptians and the sacred obsequies of Osiris*.

The mode, in which they were celebrated, was this.

In memory of Osiris being compelled to enter into an ark by Typhon or the evil genius of the ocean, an image of the god was annually placed in a boat shaped like the lunar crescent, which was set afloat upon the Nile or the *Oceanus* of Egyptian mythology. This boat was the sacred ship of the deity : in which along with the seven other great gods of the country, he was wont to be painted sailing over the waters of a boundless sea. Under this aspect, it was denominated *the Argo* : and nothing can be more evident, than that it is the same as the ship *Argha* of the kindred theology of Hindoostan. But it was likewise deemed the mystic coffin of the god : whence, as an entrance into it was esteemed the same as his death, an evasion from it was esteemed the same as his restoration to life. Agreeably therefore to such a view of the matter, when the god entered into his floating coffin, he was bewailed as one dead, and was anxiously sought as one snatched away from the sight of mortals : but, when the funereal ship came to land, and when the god was taken out of it, he was rejoiced over as one recovered from the dead, and was celebrated as one found after a long disappearance.

2. Very little penetration is necessary to develop the meaning of this curious ceremony.

Every part of the fabled character of Osiris demonstrates him, so far as his humanity is concerned, to be the scriptural Noah. Now, in the allegorising phraseology of antiquity, the great patriarch, who was the chief hero god and the reputed oldest king of every nation, was said to die out of one world and to be born again into another. Hence the ark, within which he was for a season concealed, was of course viewed as his floating coffin : and his liberation from the ark was his restoration to life, or his return from the realms of Hades. Such speculations obviously made the worship of Egypt funereal. Osiris was bewailed as one dead, when he entered into his ship or his floating coffin : and he was welcomed as one restored from the dead, when his ark came to land and when his image was taken out of it.

3. If this obvious explanation of the ceremony required any confirmation, we should find it in the kindred fable of Hindoostan.

Osiris, or (as his name is properly written) *Isiris*, stands connected, in the theology of Egypt, with his consort *Isis* and his ship *Argo* ; just as *Iwara*, in the theology of Hindoostan, stands connected with his consort *Isi* and his ship *Argha*. For, in the theology of Egypt, the ship *Argo* was deemed a form of *Isis* ; and *Isiris* is driven into it by the fury of Typhon, who is honestly con-

fessed to be a personification of the Ocean, and who is said to obtain the sovereignty of the whole world after Isiris has taken refuge in the ship; while, in the theology of Hindostan, the ship *Argha* is similarly deemed a form of *Isi*; and *Iswara* enters into it at a time when the whole world is overwhelmed by the waters of the ocean. Such a coincidence both of names and of arbitrary circumstances cannot be accidental: it is not more evident, that the *Iswara* and the *Isi* and the ship *Argha* of Hindostan are the *Isiris* and the *Isis* and the ship *Argo* of Egypt, than that the one legend is explanatory of the other. But there cannot be a reasonable doubt, that the legend, of *Iswara entering into the ship Argha when the whole earth is overflowed by the ocean*, and of *Iswara and Argha being metamorphosed into two doves when the waters retire*, is the history of the general deluge given in the peculiar language of the pagan hierophants. Therefore the parallel legend of *Isiris being driven into the ship Argo by the fury of the murderous ocean*, and the funeral ceremonies which were founded upon it, must also relate to the history of the general deluge.

V. We shall now begin to perceive the reason, why each Egyptian pyramid, though like every other pyramid a copy of mount Meru or mount Ararat, was yet very truly, according to *their* theological speculations, declared by the priesthood to be the tomb of a very ancient king of the country.

If the ark was the allegorical coffin of Osiris, mount Ararat, where the ark rested many weeks before his liberation from its dark interior, would of course be his tomb: and, as that gloomy interior resembled an immense and darksome cavern, it was mystically denominated *a cave* in the mountain itself. Hence originated those legends, which we frequently meet with, of the arkite family being preserved in a great sea-girt cavern during the prevalence of the deluge: and hence natural caverns in natural high-places came to be deemed peculiarly sacred. When therefore a pyramid or an artificial high-place was to be constructed, it was always furnished with a dark cavernous chamber: and, as mount Ararat was at once the altar and the allegorical tomb of the patriarch; every pyramid, though used sacrificially as an altar, was not on that account the less esteemed his tomb also. But the patriarch, under the name of *Osiris*, was the reputed first king of Egypt; just as, under some other name, he was the reputed first king of every other country. Hence the priesthood, truly enough according to their enigmatical mode of expressing themselves, told the inquisitive Greeks, that each pyramid was the tomb of a very ancient king. By this ancient king *they* meant the hero-god Osiris, and his tomb was such another tomb as the Cretans showed for the sepulchre of their chief hero-god *Zan* or *Jupiter*: but the Greeks took them *literally*; and thence handed down to posterity, that the pyramids were *literal* tombs of certain *literal* Egyptian kings.

VI. The funeral character of the pyramids of Ghiza is no way

peculiar to them : the very same funereal character is ascribed to other pyramids also in other countries ; and doubtless the same interpretation is to be given of it, wherever it occurs.

Thus, according to Herodotus and Strabo, the pyramid of Babylon was indifferently called *the temple* and *the tomb* of Belus : thus, throughout Greece, those tumuli, which were reported to be the tombs of the hero-gods, were deemed also their temples, if the term can properly be applied to artificial coniform high-places : thus, among the Celts of Britain, each high-place of the ship-god Hu was called his *grave* : and thus, at the present day, the pyramids, which throughout the east are dedicated to the diluvian Buddha, and which are declared to be copies of the holy mount Meru or Ararat, are said to be at once *the temples* and *the tombs* of the god : whence the priests frequently show as relics certain fragments of bones, which they give out to be portions of the sacred bones of the hero-god himself.

The Greek writers therefore did not so much err in handing down to us, that the pyramids of Egypt were *tombs* ; as they erred in fancying them to be *literal* tombs of the ancient *literal* kings of the country. *Tombs* they doubtless were : but they were the tombs of no such literal kings, as Cheops or Mycerinus or Cephrenes. On the contrary, in strict accordance with the funereal worship of the old pagans, they were each the mystical tomb or high-place of that reputed first king of every primitive nation ; who by the Egyptians was denominated *Osiris* or *Ammon* or *Phtha* ; by the Chaldeans *Belus* or *Oannes* ; by the Phenicians *Adonis* or *Thammuz* ; by the Hindoos *Buddha* or *Menu* or *Iswara* ; by the Celts *Hu* or *Dylan* ; and by the Mexicans *Vitzli-Putzli* or *Mexitli*. The dark central chamber was the allegorical sepulchre of the god : the level platform on the summit smoked with the sacrifices devoted to him. The same platform was frequently used also as an astronomical observatory ; for the demonolatry of the Gentiles was inseparably blended with their astrolatry. It is to be feared, that in every part of the world these gigantic altars have been polluted with human blood : but the Mexicans to the last offered up men on the summits of their own national pyramids, which their traditions avow to be professed imitations of the mountain where Xelhua and his family were preserved during the prevalence of an universal deluge.

VII. Such was the theory relative to the pyramids of Egypt, which I was induced to offer in my work on *the Origin of Pagan Idolatry* ; a theory, not lightly or fancifully adopted, but regularly built on the known worship of the country, and on the rational principles of inductive comparison. A late very interesting discovery has completely established this theory, and has set at rest for ever the much agitated question of the design and use of the pyramids.

On the 2d of March in the year 1818, the long-closed pyramid of Cephrenes was opened by the skill and perseverance of Mr. Bel-

zoni. Like the large pyramid, it was found to contain a dark chamber and a stone sarcophagus: but the 'sarcophagus, instead of being empty, was occupied by a few bones. These bones, according to the vulgar notion that each pyramid is a literal tomb of a literal Egyptian sovereign, were naturally enough supposed by Mr. Belzoni to be human: and the question was now thought to be determined in favor of the old opinion handed down to us by the Greek writers. Soon after the opening of the pyramid, however, it was entered by Major Fitz-Clarence; who sacrilegiously brought away with him a portion of the supposed venerable remains of the primeval Cephrenes. So royal a fragment of the mighty dead could befit none, save a royal cabinet. The august bone was reverently presented to the Prince Regent: and the Prince committed the relic of his defunct brother sovereign, big with the fate of jarring systems, to the inspection of Sir Everard Home. Not more fatal to the antique shield of the renowned Dr. Cernelius was the impious scouring of the cleanly housemaid, a scouring which converted the ærugo-stripped buckler into a scone, than the inspection of an accomplished English surgeon proved to the thigh-bone of Cephrenes. The relic turned out to be, not the bone of A MAN, but the bone of A COW.

VIII. Yet, however ludicrous according to our modern notions of bovine dignity may be the bathos produced by this whimsical circumstance, it would have presented nothing ridiculous to the mind of an ancient Egyptian deeply imbued in the religious speculations of his country.

From time to time, Osiris was supposed to become incarnate in the body of the sacred bull Mucis: and, whenever that venerated animal died, another, distinguished by certain marks well known to the priesthood, was diligently sought for in order to supply the place of the defunct. When such a bull was at length discovered, he was inaugurated with much solemnity: the soul of the god was forthwith believed to enter into him: and he was thence worshipped as the visible image of Osiris himself. We have received from Diodorus Siculus a curious account of the mode, in which every newly found Mucis was floated down the Nile in the mysterious Baris: and, on the Bembine table, we may still behold the figure of the animal standing in that holy navicular coffin.

It was one of these bestial Avatars of Osiris (to adapt the technical language of the kindred theology of Hindostan), that was committed after his death to the dark sepulchral chamber of the pyramid ascribed to Cephrenes: the bone, brought home by Major Fitz-Clarence, and at first mistaken for the thigh-bone of an Egyptian king, was evidently a bone of the sacred bull Mucis: the sarcophagus, that contained this curious and decisive remnant of the animal's skeleton, was the ship Argo executed in stone (by the Greeks denominated *the stone-ship of Dionusus*), which was at once the ark and the reputed coffin of Osiris: and the pyramid

itself, like the pyramid of Babylon, the pyramid of the Mexican Cholula, and the numerous pyramids dedicated to Buddha, was an artificial copy of the sacred mount of the appulses.

Exactly the same remarks apply also to the larger pyramid of Cheops, the interior of which has long been accessible. *There* the stone Argo is empty: but, when we consider the length of time during which the pyramid has been open, it is not very difficult to account for the disappearance of its contents. In the course of a few years, the Argo of the pyramid opened by Mr. Belzoni will be as empty as its fellow: the example of Major Fitz-Clarence will soon, no doubt, be followed by succeeding travellers: and the bones of the holy bull will all find their way to the cabinets of Europe.

IX. Most probably the sarcophagus or navicular coffin in the larger pyramid once contained the bones of another Mnevis: though I think it not unlikely, that it *may* have held the bones of a man. If such however were the case, the man was no king of Egypt: for be it observed, though the discovery of the bones of the bull Mnevis within the pyramid of Cephrenes effectually demolishes the notion that the pyramids were *literal* tombs of *literal* kings, the discovery of a human skeleton in the same place would not have overturned the opinion that each pyramid was a mystic tomb of Osiris.

1. Throughout a large part of the east, Buddha, who is the same mythological character as Osiris under a different name, is devoutly believed, even at the present day, to become incarnate, both in the successive Lamas of Thibet, and likewise in many other Lamas of inferior note who are to be found in various regions of Asia. The natural consequence of this circumstance is, that certain bones are shown at each pyramid of Buddha, as the sacred relics of the incarnate god. I say *the natural consequence*, because there cannot be much doubt, that the human bones thus exhibited are the bones of those deceased Lamas, who during their life-time were supposed to be Avatars of the deity.

Now the successive incarnations of Buddha in each human Lama differ only in a single point from the successive incarnations of Osiris in each bovine Mnevis: every Avatar of Buddha is *a man*; every Avatar of Osiris was *a bull*. But, though *the form* may be different in the two cases, *the superstition* is radically the same. If then Osiris was ever supposed to become incarnate in the figure of a man, the identical superstition, which placed the dead body of the bull Mnevis in the sepulchral chamber of the Cephrenic pyramid; would certainly have placed the dead body of the man, who had been revered as the fleshly vehicle of the god, in the sepulchral chamber of any other pyramid. Hence, even if a human skeleton instead of a bovine had been found within the pyramid of Cephrenes, I should have considered it as no satisfactory proof, that the pyramids were literal tombs of the literal Egyptian kings.

Analogy would rather have led me to conclude, that a human skeleton, so situated, was not the skeleton of an ancient king who had caused the pyramid to be built as his tomb; but that it was the skeleton of the man, who during his life-time had been deemed an Avatar of Osiris, and who thence after his death was placed within the mystic tomb of the god.

2. I have said, however, that very possibly the sarcophagus in the larger pyramid may once have contained the skeleton of a man; though on this point nothing positive can of course be asserted; and I have moreover said, that should this have been the case, I should have concluded the skeleton to have belonged to some Egyptian Lama, who was given out to be an incarnation of Osiris. It may be proper therefore to state the grounds, on which I suspect that Osiris, who was said to be incarnate in each successive *bull Mnevis*, was sometimes fabled to be also incarnate in a *man*; just as Buddha is feigned to be incarnate in every successive Lama of Thibet.

My authority for this supposition is a very curious passage in Herodotus.

That writer tells us, that, at Chemmis in the Thebaid, there was a celebrated temple of Perseus, square in its form, and doubtless (according to the universal principle of the Egyptian buildings) exhibiting the figure of a truncated pyramid by the declension of its four walls from the perpendicular. Within the consecrated inclosure, which seems exactly to have resembled those consecrated inclosures that still surround the oriental pyramids of Buddha, were the shrine and statue of the god: and the inhabitants of Chemmis affirmed, that the divinity himself often appeared both in the country and in the temple. Sometimes the priests pretended to find one of his sandals, which was of the gigantic size of two cubits: and, whenever that was the case, it augured a year of unusual fertility.¹

What the Chemmites told Herodotus was, I dare say, perfectly true. Perseus was the same character as Osiris: or, to speak more properly, one of the many names of Osiris was *Perseus*. Hence, because Osiris was set afloat in an ark during his annual commemorative festival, the Greeks, who received a great part of their national superstition from Egypt, had a fable that Perseus and his mother Danaë were likewise set afloat in an ark upon the waters of the mighty deep. At Chemmis then, it seems, Osiris, venerated under the name of *Perseus*, was supposed to become incarnate in the body of a *man*; as, in other parts of Egypt, he was supposed to become incarnate in the body of a *bull*. This pretended human Avatar of the god was plainly enough the person, who, as the Chemmites told Herodotus, often appeared both in the country and in the temple. The superstition in short of Chemmis was exactly the same, as the superstition which still prevails in Thibet:

¹ Herod. Hist. lib. ii. cap. 91.

and the curious circumstance of the gigantic sandal sufficiently proves the identity of Buddha and Perseus. As the Egyptian priests showed the vast sandal of their national god; so do the Buddhist priests, even at the present day, point out to the veneration of the people various pretended impressions of the gigantic foot of their favorite deity.

3. If then the precise superstition, which now prevails in Thibet and various other regions of the east, ever prevailed in Egypt; that is to say, if Osiris was sometimes believed to become incarnate in the person of *a man*, as Buddha is believed to become incarnate in the person of the Thibetian Lama: nothing can be more clear, than that the same religious speculations, which caused the sepulture of *a dead bull* within the pyramid of Cephrenes, might equally cause the sepulture of *a dead man* within any other pyramid. But, in this case, *the dead man* would not be *a literal Egyptian king*: he would obviously be neither more nor less than *a reputed human Avatar of Osiris*, who was fabled to be the earliest king of Egypt.

Hence, if the pyramid of Mycerinus should ever be opened, and if *a human skeleton* should ever be found within it; the circumstance must assuredly be interpreted by the *already* known circumstance that *a bovine skeleton* has been found within the pyramid of Cephrenes. For, since the pyramids must all have been erected under the influence of the same idea, whatever that idea was; and since the discovery of *a bovine skeleton* in the sepulchral chamber of the Cephrenic pyramid is palpably fatal to the vulgar notion, that the pyramids were literal tombs of literal kings: we may be sure, that any *human skeleton* deposited in the pyramid of Mycerinus (should such a thing be hereafter discovered) must have been deposited there under the impression of the same religious idea, as that which led to the sepulture of *the bull Mneuis* within the pyramid of Cephrenes; and consequently we may be sure, that any such *human skeleton* would not be the skeleton of an Egyptian sovereign.

4. As yet however no human skeleton has been discovered in *any* of the pyramids: nought has been found save *the bone of an unlucky BULL*; and this bone is placed in so provokingly *preeminent* a station, to wit, *the mystic coffin itself in the very heart of the pyramid*, that no reasonable doubt can be entertained that *THE BULL* was the *primary* object of consideration in the construction of the edifice.

Had a *human skeleton* been found royally paramount in a more costly sarcophagus, while the skeletons of different *animals* reposed around it in lower and less splendid sarcophagi; it might at least have been a plausible conjecture, that the human skeleton was that of an ancient king, while the bestial skeletons were those of animals which had been slaughtered to accompany their master to the nether world. But instead of any such imagined arrangement, a

single solitary coffin is discovered in a superb chamber, which has been ascertained to lie under the very apex of the pyramid: and this coffin, to which *alone* the post of honor is given, has been found upon examination to contain, not the bones of A MAN, but the bones of A BULL. There cannot therefore be a shadow of rational doubt, that A BULL was the creature, in honor of which the Cephrenic pyramid was constructed. But we may be sure, that no such labor would have been undertaken in honor of A BULL, unless with a reference to the peculiar theological aspect under which the Egyptians beheld that animal. Now we all know, that A BULL was deemed the living image and the corporeal vehicle of THE GOD OSIRIS. Hence it follows, as clear as the day is light, that the post of honor in the pyramid was given to THE BULL, *because* he was deemed an Avatar of THE GOD.

Thus at length we are brought irresistibly to the conclusion, that each of the famous pyramids of Egypt was a mystic tomb or high-place of that Osiris, who was annually bewailed as dead, and who was annually committed to what was indifferently styled *his ship* and *his coffin*: thus consequently we are also brought to the negative conclusion, that the pyramids of Egypt were NOT literal tombs of certain ancient literal sovereigns of the country.

X. Two corollaries result from this discussion, which are much too interesting to be passed over in silence.

1. The one is, that the peculiar superstition of Egypt must at least have been as ancient, as the erection of the pyramids.

Nothing is more evident, than that the pyramids were built for the identical purpose, to which we find them applied: for it will scarcely be contended, that the pyramids were *first* built, through mere whim or accident, each with a dark central chamber in its very heart; and that, *when* so built, they were *employed* as convenient sepulchres for the bull Mnevis, though their founders had designed them for no such purpose. Hence, in exact accordance with Holy Scripture which describes the Israelites in the wilderness as bowing down before the bestial image of the bull Mnevis, we must carry back the bovine superstition of Egypt to the earliest postdiluvian ages: for, even in the time of Herodotus the father of Greek history, the pyramids were an object of antiquarian wonder and speculation.

2 The other is, that the sepulchral worship of Osiris or Buddha or Adonis or Belus, as the same ancient character was variously denominated in various countries, could not have been more recent in its origin than the dispersion from Babel.

It is sufficiently clear, that the pyramid of Babel was constructed under the same religious impressions as the pyramids of Egypt; for there is too great a resemblance between them in matters arbitrary to have resulted from mere accident. Of this the ancients were fully sensible: and, as all the primeval nations were remarkable for their vanity, the Egyptians, instead of deducing their theo-

logy from Babel, which is the true mode of accounting for the identity of the two systems, pretended that the Babylonians had borrowed from *them*. Hence originated the idle fgment, that Belus was an Egyptian, and that out of pure philanthropy he left his own country and travelled to Babylon that he might instruct the Babylonians in the science and theology of Egypt. The fact was, the Egyptians plainly enough saw, that in all leading essentials their own pyramids were the very counterpart of the Babylonian pyramid, and that their own superstition was the mere double of the Babylonian superstition. What then was to be done in this emergency? They boldly claimed the Babylonian Belus, whose pyramid on the banks of the Euphrates was at once his tomb and his high-place, as their own countryman: and, having given him the god of the sea for his father (the usual allegorical origin of the ship-god), they sent him to teach the less learned Babylonians what all the while they had had before the Mizraim were a nation. The truth of the matter was however exactly the reverse. Instead of the theology of Babylon coming from Egypt; the theology of Egypt, like the kindred theology of all the other pagans, came from Babylon, that MOTHER of harlots and abominations of the earth. The original Babylonian tower was begun by Nimrod before the dispersion: and the very nature of its construction, far unlike that of the easily dilapidated house-temples of Greece and Rome, would effectually prevent its evanescence; for it were just as rational, to talk of one of the Egyptian pyramids tumbling down and disappearing, as to talk of the evanescence of the huge Babylonian pyramid. Thus left unfinished by Nimrod, it remained for many ages. At length, when Babylon once more became the seat of empire, it seems to have been repaired and carried up to its originally intended height by the magnificent Nebuchadnezzar.¹

Now from such premises the conclusion, which I would draw, is this:

As the building of the Egyptian pyramids necessarily supposes the already existing superstition to which they were devoted; so the building of the Babylonian pyramid equally supposes the previous existence of a kindred superstition which in fact gave rise to its construction. Agreeably to the just opinion of the Hindoo theologians, the pyramid on the banks of the Euphrates, an *artificial* mountain raised in a flat country where there are no *natural* mountains, was the first-erected copy of the holy mount Meru or Ararat.

¹ See this interesting topic discussed at considerable length in my *Horæ Mosaicæ*, book 1. sect. i. chap. 5. §. 11. 7. 2d edit.

MISCELLANEA CLASSICA.

NO. VIII.

I. IN a ghostly legend cited from Matthew Paris in a late Number of Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine (Vol. vi. p. 85.), the apparition of a person deceased is made to say to his surviving friend—"I am plunged into the sulphureous gulph of hell; where, so long as the stars roll round the pole, and the waves of the sea break upon the shore, I shall continue to be tormented for my sins:" a manifest, though singular plagiarism, from the concluding line of Claudian's Rufinus, where Minos is introduced as passing a sentence of condemnation upon the object of the poet's invective;

————— Agitate flagellis
Trans Styga, trans Erebum: vacuo mandate barathro
Infra Titani tenebras, infraque recessus
Tartareos, nostrumque Chaos, qua noctis opacæ
Fundamenta latent, penitusque immersus anhelet,
Dum rotet astra polus, fenant dum littora venti.

II. Instances of alliteration from ancient authors:—Hom. Od. E. 245. ξέσσε τ' ἐπισταμένως, καὶ ἐπὶ σταθμῇ ἴθουεν. Υ. 333. οἰμωγὴ δὲ δέδρε, δεδάκρυται δὲ παρειαί. (An instance of a somewhat different kind occurs E. 282. τὸν δ' ἐξ Αἰθιώπων ἀνδρῶν κρείων Ἐλοπιχθων Τηλεθεὺς ἐκ Σολύμων ὀρέων ἴδε.) The following, or nearly the following, (for we quote from memory,) occurs in one of the latter books of Livy:—"Priusquam prætores proficiscerentur, prodigia per pontifices procurari placuit." It may perhaps be conjectured, from various passages in their works, that the Latin poets exercised a licence in alliterating with the letter *r*, which they did not extend in the same degree to any other letter. Can any inference be drawn from this circumstance, if true, with regard to their pronunciation of that consonant?

III. Edinburgh Review for Nov. 1814, art. Boyd's Translations from the Greek Fathers. "St. Gregory, in the Funeral Oration upon Cæsar, says, that the tears of his mother were subdued by philosophy—*ἡττωμένοις τῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ*—but this is too inatter-of-fact for Mr. Boyd, who renders it: "her tears are dried by the sweet breezes of philosophy." p. 70. The critic might have traced this embellishment to the pages of his countryman, Walter Scott—

The tear, that gather'd in his eye,
He left the mountain breeze to dry.

Lady of the Lake, Canto III. St. xix.

Another unauthorised addition, quoted in the next page, appears to be from the stores of a modern writer on infidelity.

IV. To the former instances of metrical lines add Tac. Ann. iii. 12. "Si quos propinquus sanguis, aut fides sua—."

V. Mitford (Hist. of Greece, Vol. vii. p. 46, note) in relating a series of transactions by which Dionysius the elder and his party obtained the supreme power in the Syracusan state, observes: "The worst irregularity that the defeated party could impute, was, that Dionysius repeatedly incurred the penalty for proposing the removal of the generals before the expiration of their term, and that Philistus had the insolence to declare himself ready to pay it as often as it might be incurred. That Philistus would be so imprudent seems unlikely enough." We notice this passage, less for its own sake, than as exemplifying one of our historian's peculiar characteristics, which may be defined an unwillingness to believe that any person of eminent abilities can ever have been guilty of a rash or absurd action. This disposition may be traced in many passages of his work, as in the parts which relate to the lives of Themistocles, Alcibiades, and others. The act here attributed to Philistus by the historians of the opposite party, so far from being improbable, appears to us rather in character, when considered as the act of a youthful statesman, in a democracy like that of Syracuse, and heated by the tumult of party; and this consonance would seem to be an argument in favor of its authenticity.

VI. Œdipus, in Sophocles, speaking of the place in which he is to die, says, addressing Theseus:

τοῦτον δὲ φράζε μὴ ποτ' ἀνθρώπων τινὶ,
μήθ' οὗ κέκευθε, μήτ' ἐν οἷς κεῖται τόποις. 1522.

And again, l. 1530, referring to certain other particulars connected with the same subject:

— αὐτὸς αἰεὶ σῶζε, χῶταν εἰς τέλος
τοῦ ἔην ἀφικνῇ, τῷ προφερτάτῳ μόνῳ
σήμεν· ὁ δ' αἰεὶ τῷ πινόντι δεικνύτω.

See in the notes to Scott's Lay of the Last Minstrel, a similar tradition relative to the tomb of the celebrated magician, Michael Scott.

VII. The dying reply of Anaxagoras to his friend is well known: πρὸς τὸν δυσφοροῦντα, ὅτι ἐπὶ ξένης τελευτᾷ, Παιταχόθεν, ἔφη, ὅμοια ἔστιν ἢ εἰς ἑδὸν κατὰβασις. A very similar story is related of our own Howard.

VIII. In Class. Journ. No. XL. p. 352, a work is mentioned under the title of "Veteris Mediæ et Persiæ Monumenta." Is the proper name *Persia*, which occurs not unfrequently in modern Latin, sanctioned by any ancient writer?—In p. 342, six lines from the bottom, for "niveæ lacertæ," read "nivei lacerti."—Misc. Class. No. VII., same number of Class. Journ. p. 344. l. 6. for αὐτέων read αὐτῶν. P. 345, eight lines from the bottom, for "vel," read "aut." P. 350, l. 13, for ξύμμαχον read ξύμμαχον. p. 351. two lines from the bottom, dele the second period. In

the same article (p. 8), by a singular oversight, a couple of verses were quoted as part of an ancient Scandinavian poem, translated in Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, which supposed piece of antiquity, on a closer inspection of the article in which it was contained, was discovered to be merely one of those satirical jeux d'esprit, which (as it will be remembered) were periodically levelled from the pages of that facetious work against its elder competitor, on occasion of the literary schism which gave birth to the former. This is recorded for the benefit of future collectors of miscellaneous remarks. To Milton's imitation of Euripides's ἡλίου κανὼν σαφής, (Misc. Class. No. VI. Class. Journ. XXXVIII. p. 331.) add a modern writer (Literary Pocket Book for 1819) who describes "the early sun striking magnificently into the warm mists, *as if he measured them with his mighty rule.*" To the illustrations of Josephus's μικρὸς γὰρ ἦν, κ. τ. λ. add the following from one of those repositories of original reflection and imagery, our old writers: "His soul," says Fuller, speaking of a person of small stature, "had but a short diocese to visit, and therefore might the better attend the effectual informing thereof."

IX.

I. Judicium Herculis. Fragmentum.

Merserat unda diem, et tremulas quatientia flammæ
 Astra suam explicuere vicem. per amœna quieti
 Ruris inaccessos petiit Tiryntia saltus
 Progenies, fontemque adiit, quem populus albens
 Luxuria foliorum et opacis texerat umbris.
 Mens ibi venturæ dum ingentia tempora vitæ
 Prospicit, immensoque hæret stupefacta labore;
 Cœruleus subito nitor et jucundior aer¹
 Illuxit campis, niveaque per aëra veste
 Cincta dea allapsa est, sceptroque insignis eburno.
 Perque humeros leves, per candida pectora nullis
 Interfusa fluit gemmis coma. conscius horret
 Aër, et nemora alta tremunt; fœsus ipse renidet,
 Attollitque vada, et placidis immurmurat undis.
 Ignea quum rutilæ mitescens lumina frontis
 Accessit propior juveni, et sic voce locuta est:
 "Huc ades, o magni soboles Jovis, o nova læti
 Spes cœli, et sacræ dudum expectate cohorti!
 Sint procul insani cœtus, quos dira Voluptas
 Fumosa ducit dexa per avia tæda,
 Attonitosque agit, et simul furialibus urget.
 Non dulces epulas, Tyrii neque somnia lecti,
 Nec fremitus iræ, et tacitum sub pectore amorem,
 Numina nostra dabunt: aliud super æthera Virtus

¹ Claudian.

Monstrat iter : bella, et casus, savosque labores
Me duce persequere, et patrii scande ardua cœli.

“ Haud faciles præbent aditus, sacraeve patescunt
Sponte fores : longis illuc conatibus itur.
Quare age, militiæ jam nunc accingere nostræ,
Sollicitamque iram, et dubii pectoris æstus.

“ Rumpere moras : tacitis properant Oblivia pennis,
Omniaque æterna condunt mortalia nocte :
Sola inter tenebras propria se luce tuctur
Clari fama animi, molemque relinquit inertem,
Cognatasque petit sedes : velut igneus ales
Ætheri Jovis, incepto quum fluctuat æther
Turbine, et in toto densantur nubila campo,
Surgit, fulmineoque secans nigrum æra cursa
Erigit ad Solem pennas, intactaque nocte
Pervolat spatia, et summo bibit æthere lumen.”

2. (Fragmentum.)

O tui quæcumque per arva ruris
Immemor fortasse mei vagaris
Appetens florum, tenebrasque figis,
Sylvia, plantas :
Sis precor felix ubicumque mavis,
Sis precor toto mihi corde felix,
Juncta mi quondam puerili ad munus
Pectus amore.

3. (Fragmentum de anima boni viri corpore excedente)

Ille, invidendis functus honoribus,
Nexuque rerum liber alieno,
Molle interm cœli quietus
Carpit iter, sonitumque mundi,
Lapsusque subter præterentium
Exaudit amorum, haud secus ac freti
Viator ex alta reclinis
Exiguum bibit arce murmur.

X. Parallel passages continued.

1. Jamque volans apicem et latera ardua cernit
Atlantis duri, cœlum qui vertice fulcit :
Atlantis, cinctum assidue eni nubibus atris
Piniferum caput et vento pulsatur et imbri :
Nix humeros infusa tegit : tum flumina mento
Præcipitat senis, et glacie riget horrida barba.
Virg. Æn. iv. 246.

A similar picture occurs in Lord Byron's *Manfred* :

Mont Blanc is the monarch of mountains,
 They crowned him long ago
 On a throne of rocks, in a robe of clouds,
 With a diadem of snow.
 Around his waist are forests braced,
 The Avalanche in his hand.

2. Nullum numen abest, si sit prudentia. *Juv. Sat. x. l. penult.*

Crabbe concludes one of his tales (containing an account of a spectral warning) with a somewhat similar γνῶμη :

If our discretion tells us how to live,
 We need no ghost an helping hand to give ;
 But if discretion cannot us restrain,
 It then appears a ghost would come in vain.
Tales of the Hall, Vol. ii. p. 185.

3. In the *Phœnissæ* of Euripides, the dying Polynices says of his brother :

φίλος γὰρ, ἐχθρὸς ἐγένετ', ἀλλ' ὅμως φίλος. 1455.

Is this the same sort of feeling which Cassius attributes to Brutus in Shakspeare ?

Strike as thou didst at Cæsar; for I know,
 When thou didst hate him worst, thou lov'dst him better
 Than ever thou lov'dst Cassius. *Julius Cæsar.*

4. Albi nostrorum sermonum candide iudex,
 Quid nunc te dicam facere — ?
 An tacitum sylvas inter reptare salubres,
 Curantem quicquid dignum sapiente bonoque est ?
Hor. Lib. 1. Ep. iv. 1.

Perhaps Cowper had this passage in his eye, when he wrote, in the interesting sketch of his own situation, contained in book 111. of the *Task* :

— With few associates, in remote
 And silent woods I wander —
 Here much I ruminate, as much I may,
 With other views of men and manners now
 Than once, &c.

The passage of Fletcher referred to in a criticism on another part of the same passage, (*Misc. Class. No. VII. Class. Journ. XL. p. 351.*) as the possible origin of the lines "I was born of woman," &c. may be here subjoined :

————— Sure I am mortal,
 The daughter of a shepherd; he was mortal,

And she who bare me mortal. Prick my hand,
And it will bleed ; a fever shakes me, and
The self-same wind that makes the young lambs shrink,
Makes me a-cold.

Faithful Shepherdess, Act i. Sc. 1.

See also Shylock's well-known complaint, in the Merchant of Venice.

5. In an account of the Sikhs, abridged from Colonel Malcolm, we are told that "Nanac (the founder of the religion of the Sikhs) taught the omnipotence of God, and that he dwells not more particularly in one place than another: for, when reproached once by the Mahometans for lying with his feet toward the house of God, 'Turn then,' said he, 'if you can, where the house of God is not.'" This noble sentence coincides with the sentiment expressed in the well-known passage of Lucan (*Phars.* ix.):

Estne Dei templum nisi terra, et pontus, et aër,
Et cælum, et virtus ! ¹

Again: "He himself was directed (by the Deity) to put on armour that will hurt no one; that his coat of mail was to be that of understanding;—that he was to fight with valor, but with no other weapon than the word of God." Compare Ephes. vi. 13—15. 17. "Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God;—Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breast-plate of righteousness; and your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace—and take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God."

6. Dextra mihi deus, et telum, quod missile libro,
Nunc adsint. *Virg. Æn.* x. 773.

Dryden improves on this: his hero, in the Virgin Martyr, swears
— by the gods (by Maximin I meant).

7. Ὁ δὲ (Δημοσθένης) — ὥς περ εἰ καταβροῦνται καὶ καταφέγγει τοὺς ἀπ' αἰῶνος ῥήτορας. Longin. de Subl. xxxiv. Hence perhaps Smollett, of Lord Chatham: "It (his eloquence) flashed like the lightning of heaven against the ministers and sons of corruption, blasting where it smote, and withering the nerves of opposition."

8. αἱ δ' [ῥήτορες] ἐνδακῶσαι σφοδρὰ περιγεῖν ἢ γραβοῖς
βίῳ φέρονσιν, οὔτε νανκλῆρου χερὸς,
οὔθ' ἱπποδέσμων, οὔτε κολλητῶν ὄχλων

¹ The climax in this passage of Lucan resembles that in Is. lvi. 15. "For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity: I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit."

μεταστρέφουσαι· καὶ μὲν εἰς τὰ μαλθακὰ
γαίης ἔχων εἰακας ἰθύνου δρόμον, κ. τ. λ.

A similar comparison occurs somewhere in one of Chapman's plays. Lord Byron's lines are perhaps not irrelevant.

Once more upon the waters yet once more!
And the waves bound beneath me like a steed
That knows its rider.

Childe Harold, iv. St. 2.

The germ of the simile might be contained in Homer's ἀλὸς ἵπποι, quoted on a former occasion.

9. Sorrows destroy us or themselves. Sir T. Browne.

All suffering doth destroy, or is destroy'd,
Ev'n by the sufferer.

Lord Byron, Ch. Harold, Canto iv.

10. — Pater orantes caesorum Tartarus umbras,
Nube cava, tandem ad meritæ spectacula pugnae
Emittit: summi nigrescunt culmina montis.

Val. Flacc.

So Statius, on occasion of the single combat between Eteocles and Polyneices:

Ipsæ quoque Ogygios monstra ad gentilia manes
Tartareus Rector porta jubet ire reclusa:
Montibus insidunt patris, tristisque corona
Inferere diem, et vinci sua crimina gaudent. *Theb.* xi.

Southey (Notes to Joan of Arc, Vol. ii. p. 179,) has quoted a passage from May's Supplement to Lucan, which he states to be an imitation of the above lines of Valerius Flaccus, but which bear obvious marks of having been, in part at least, suggested by those of Statius.

CÆCILII METELLI S.



AN INQUIRY

*into the Opinions of the ancient Hebrews, respecting a
future immortal Existence.*

העולם הבא מדרגת באה לאדם אחר יום הדין הגדול שהוא אחר
תחיית התיים :

Sepher Ikkarim, l. iv. c. 31.

Ἀπόκειται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀπὸ ἀποθανεῖν, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις.

Heb. ix. 27.

No. I.

GROTIUS, Spencer, Marsham, and Warburton, conceived the promises of God to the early Israelites to have been of a temporal nature, and did not imagine them to have been influenced by higher motives, or to have extended their hopes and ideas beyond this present transient state of things. But this opinion appears by no means warranted by Scripture: from detached passages, superficially examined, such a statement may, indeed, seem inferrible, though a more accurate survey of parallels in their natural connexions with preceding and subsequent verses will readily exhibit the fallacy of this extraordinary doctrine. The Gentile world in the earliest æras recorded by history, and in the most ancient specimens of wild and primitive poetry, is a demonstration, that the belief of a future state was indelibly imprinted on the human mind by the Creator; and from the expectations of immortal rewards and punishments, exactly proportioned to the virtues or delinquencies of this life, we have every reason to suppose that these originated in some divine communication made to the earlier members of the human race. As sacred history assures us, that the Chaldeans, Syrians, and Egyptians, *in particular*, practised their superstitions, and of course accredited the fables on which they were founded, before the compilation of the Pentateuch, so we have incontrovertible authority that this main part of their theology then existed. Since it must, therefore, have been a well-known doctrine at the period when the Israelites sojourned in Egypt, it was in no ways requisite for Moses to enter into a minute detail of it: if he refers to it in the same manner as he refers to other established facts, it will be sufficient to show, that in his time, the children of Israel looked forwards to a future state: nor may we deem it contrary to reason to presume, that God revealed it to Adam and the Patriarchs, in some of those manifestations of his presence recorded by the inspired penman, and that when the earth became peopled, each colony in its emigrations disseminated it far and wide. But,

30 *An Inquiry into the Opinions of the*

it may be admitted, that although it was received as well by the apostate tribes of idolaters, as by the servants of the true God, and couched under various symbols and allegories, the minutie of it became more and more accurately apprehended under the instructions of the prophets, until it was explicitly revealed, and distinctly promulgated by our Saviour, who brought life and immortality to light by his Gospel.

The promise of redemption, believed in every age of the Jewish Church to be fulfilled in the days of the Messiah, was not simply understood to appertain to this life, but to an existence to come. Adam hardly inferred the recovery of the terrestrial paradise from the promise made to Eve; he assuredly conceived it to extend to eternal felicity and communion with the Supreme Being in another world. Hence, the New Testament marks a strong antithesis between the type and the anti-type; the natural father of the human race, as well in it as in the rabbinical writers, is aptly denominated the first Adam. The Son of God, the spiritual Father of mankind, and author of everlasting life, is stiled the second Adam, called in Cabbalistical language אדם קדמון. Moses Haddarshan, (Ber. Rabba. xxxiv. 67.) accordingly, weaves this ancient doctrine into the fable of Messiah the Son of David going to Kippód, the angel of death, at the gates of hell, when the captives therein confined, beholding the light of the Messiah, exultingly, deemed the prophecy in Hosea xvi. 14. accomplished, and expected immediate redemption, as it is written, מִיַּד שְׂאוֹל וּמָמוֹת. In the same ancient work we read, that redemption was, of old, understood to be two-fold; one species from the servitude of nations, the other from the angel of death. In the narrative of man's creation, Moses distinguishes between the body created after God's image from the dust of the earth, and the soul communicated to it by the breath of God: and this distinction is repeatedly enforced in Scripture, where this dust or body is exhibited as returning to its original earth, and the spirit to that Divine Essence from which it proceeded.

We know not the extent of the early revelations, but we find some, by way of eminence, stiled בני אלהים, and a striking contrast maintained between בשר and רוח, which is also continued in the New Testament. Enoch was most singularly translated וַיִּתְּלַךְ חֲנוֹךְ אֶת הָאֱלֹהִים וַאֲמִינוּ כִּי לָקַח אֹתוֹ אֱלֹהִים—Abraham is said to have “looked for a city, which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God:” on this subject our Saviour expressly declares, περὶ δὲ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑμῖν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, λέγοντος· Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραάμ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσαακ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰακώβ; οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Θεός, Θεὸς νεκρῶν, ἀλλὰ ζώντων. Jacob, in his sublime prophecy, looked forwards to the salvation of Jehovah, and predicted the time and family of Shiloh. Moses Bar Nahhman and Rabbi Bechai, emphatically name THIS תְּשׁוּעַת עַרְלָמִי; and it may be remarked, *most gene-*

rally, that wherever the Hebrew Scriptures mention a person living in the commandments of God, the Chaldee paraphrasts, Aben Ezra in particular, and indeed the collective body of rabbinical commentators, expound the phrase by everlasting life, and vice versâ, כרת by everlasting death, which appears the most satisfactory explanation of these terms in the New Testament. Rabbi Bechai avers, that when Balaam inquires who shall number the dust of Jacob, he alludes to the resuscitation of the dead, and Rabbi Menahem on Num. xv. 31. says, that the impenitent shall be ETERNALLY punished.

The patriarchs are cited by the apostle Paul, as living in hope, and dying in full assurance of the promises : these promises must therefore have been made in the revelations recorded in Genesis : Moses, the author of the Pentateuch, who conversed with God, as no other man did, פנים על פנים, "had respect unto the recompence of the reward," and chose rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season ; enduring, as seeing HIM, who is invisible : " and we may presume that the translation of Enoch, before adduced, was intended to afford to a degenerate race a full corroboration of this doctrine, in the same manner as that of Elijah, on the revival of religion after the destruction of the Baalites, was calculated to confirm the Israelites in it, at a later period of history. Whenever a patriarch is said to die in the sacred text, the rabbinical commentators most frequently represent him as gathered to the righteous souls of his fathers. The belief of a future state forms one of the fundamentals of the Jewish faith. The Talmud deduces it from the law, the prophets, and the hagiographists ; and Joseph Albo, in Sepher Ikkarim, paras. iv. c. 35., on what authority I know not, maintains, that Ezra and the coadjutors, which the Jewish fabulists have given to him, in all their formularies of blessing, exclaimed, אתה גבור לעולם יהיה נחיה המתים. Eusebius (Præp. Evang. LXI. c. 27.) remarks, Ὁ μὲν γε Μωσὴς πρῶτος ἀθάνατον οὐσίαν εἶναι τὴν ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ ψυχὴν ὀρίσατο, εἰκόνα φήσας ὑπαρχεῖν αὐτῇ τῆς Θεοῦ. Origen urges as an argument against Celsus (l. v. p. 260.) that this doctrine was in their earliest infancy familiar to the Jews ; πῶλλον δὲ τὸ σχεδὸν ἅμα γειέσει καὶ συμπληρώσει τοῦ λόγου διὰ σκεσθαι αὐτοῦ τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀθανασίαν, καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ γῆν δικαιοσύνηα, καὶ τὰς τιμὰς τῶν καλῶς βεβιωκότων. Gamaliel, also, the instructor of St. Paul, is introduced in the Talmud, as proving the resurrection of the dead from each of the three divisions of the Hebrew Scriptures. In that most ancient commentary Pesichtha, (paras. ראה אנכי, this doctrine is established from the law ; and the Gemara of Jerusalem cites Deut. XXXI. 16. XXXII. 39. as evidences, that it was inculcated in the law, and passages too obvious to require citation to support it from the prophets and hagiographists. The Targumin of Jerusalem, and of Jonathan the son of

Uzziel, proclaim, continually, a future state*from the text of the law.

Temporal rewards and punishments would have been inadequate to religious purposes, and would have opposed but feeble barriers to idolatrous defections, and other infractions of the Divine Law. The firm persuasion of the mind *alone*, that man shall be rewarded or punished according to the deeds done in the body, could have ensured a permanent existence to religion, and enforced statutes in direct opposition to many more ancient customs. How could the devout Israelite, meditating on the attributes of God, and inferring from his own Scriptures the divine origin of his soul, have read in his tabernacle, יהוה ימלך לעלם ועד, (Exod. xv. 17, 18.) without the sure and certain hope of glory and of immortality! Could he, in fact, have believed his nation to have been planted, בְּהָר נַחֲלַת יְהוָה, and in the sanctuary, which his hands had established—if, observing the transitory machinery of affairs, he knew nothing of retributive justice beyond things temporal? It is positively certain, that he looked beyond the present constitution of things; that he expected an everlasting mountain of inheritance, and sanctuary “not made with hands, eternal in the heavens,” where Jehovah should reign for ever and ever. If we attentively consider the nature of God, from temporal judgments analogy will argue spiritual; things seen are to the inquisitive mind evidences of things not seen. In like manner, the various blessings and punishments mentioned by Moses manifestly prefigured those that will be attendant on man’s future condition. We cannot imagine so total a blank in the Mosaic system, as we must observe, if whilst other and debased nations were instructed in this important truth, the Israelites *alone*, to whom the law had been revealed by the mouth of God, and attested by extraordinary appearances, were left in ignorance of it. We divest the types and allegories of this ritual of their most excellent office, if we conceive the Israelites perfectly unacquainted with their recondite and anti typical import. That sabbath of rest, ordained to be kept for a perpetual covenant throughout their generations, as a sign between Him and them (“*because in six days God made the heavens and the earth, and rested on the seventh, and was refreshed,*”) was, undeniably, referred to that future sabbatism, anticipated by the patriarchs, and thus apprehended by all the Jewish writers. Those peculiar rites of sanctifying the congregation, and separating them from the Gentile world, כִּיאֲנִי יְהוָה מְקַדְּשֶׁכֶּם, had purposes far extending beyond the circumstances of that people, and were gradually better known as the days of the Messiah approached. The veil of the atonements and expiatory sacrifices of the law was pierced by thinking men of that dispensation: the institution of the גֹּאֲלִים, of the early Arabs, and the cities of refuge, were strong indications of further divine intentions. Passages in the 8th ch. of

Deuteronomy would alone determine the Israelites to have received this revelation: להיטבך באחריתך could not refer to temporalities, but must signify, that God here tries and proves men to qualify them for a celestial condition. In the 32nd Ch. we read likewise, "Oh! that they were wise, that they understood this!" יבינו לאחריתם! and from the 35th and 36th verses, we cannot but infer a future judgment. Accordingly, in the 29th verse of the following chapter, those who adhered to these statutes, are stiled עם נשע בידוה.

DANIEL GUILDFORD WAIT.

Blagdon Rectory.

ARABIAN STORY.

WE promised in a former Number (xxiv. December, 1815, p. 260) some account of the Arabian Story entitled *Keid al nesa*, "The Stratagems, Frauds, or Cunning Devices of Women," more happily expressed in French, "Ruse des Femmes," by Mons. Langlès, the celebrated Orientalist, who has published it with the original text at the end of his "Voyages de Sindbâd le Marin" (Paris, 1814. 18mo.) Of the *Keid al nesa* we now offer an abridged translation.

It is related that a young man of graceful stature and beautiful countenance resided formerly at Baghdad, where he was most distinguished among the sons of the merchants. One day, whilst he sat in his shop, a lovely damsel approached: having looked at him she perceived written over his door these words: "*There is no cunning equal to that of men, since it surpasses the cunning of women.*" "By my veil then I swear," said she, "this man shall be the sport of female cunning, and he shall change this inscription." On the next day she returned, most richly dressed, and attended by many slaves; under pretence of purchasing some article, she seated herself in the young man's shop. "You have beheld," said she, "the gracefulness of my person—can any one presume to affirm that I am hump-backed?" at the same time she uncovered part of her bosom—the young Merchant was fascinated. "I appeal to you," continued she, "whether I am not well formed:"—she then shewed him her finely turned arm, and her face, which in beauty equalled the moon when near its fourteenth night; saying, "Are these features marked with the small-pox? or who shall dare to insinuate that I have lost the use of one eye?" The Merchant requested to know her reasons for thus exposing to his view so many charms, generally concealed under a veil. "Sir," said she, "I am rendered miserable through the tyranny of my father, a sordid, avaricious man, who, though abounding with riches, will not ex-

pend the smallest trifle to establish me in matrimony." "Who is thy father?" inquired the Merchant. "He is the grand *Cûdhy*," replied she, and then departed. The young man in a transport of astonishment and love, shut up the doors of his shop, and hastened to the tribunal where he found the Magistrate. "I come, Sir," exclaimed he, "to demand in marriage your daughter, of whom I am enamored." "She is not worthy," replied the judge, "of so handsome and so amiable a mate." "She pleases me," said the young man; "do not oppose my wishes." A contract was immediately concluded: the Merchant agreed to pay five purses before the nuptials, and settled fifteen as a jointure. The father still represented how unsuitable the bride would prove, but the young man insisted that the nuptials should be celebrated without delay, and on the next night he was admitted to the chamber of his bride. But when he had removed the veil that covered her face, he beheld such an object! - may the Lord defend us from the sight of so much ugliness! for in her was comprised every thing completely hideous. He passed the night as if he had been in the prisons of *Deylem*, among the monstrous demons. At dawn of day he repaired to a bath, and having performed his ablutions, he returned to his shop, and refreshed himself with coffee: many of his acquaintances passing by, amused themselves with jokes respecting the charms of his bride. At length the lovely form of her who had contrived this affair, appeared before him. She was more richly and more voluptuously ornamented than on the preceding interviews; so that a crowd of persons stopped in the street to gaze on her.—"May this day," said she, "be auspicious to thee, my dear *Olu-ed-dyn*; may God protect and bless thee!" The young man's face expressed the sadness of his heart. "How have I injured thee," replied he, "that thou hast in this manner made me the object of thy sport?" "From thee," answered the beautiful stranger, "I have not experienced any affront, but if thou wilt reverse the inscription over thy door, I will engage to extricate thee from every difficulty." The Merchant instantly despatched a slave, desiring him to procure from a certain writer, an inscription in letters of blue and gold, expressing, "*There is no cunning equal to that of women, since it surpasses and confounds the cunning of men.*" The inscription was soon traced, and brought by the slave to his master, who placed it over the door of his shop. Then, by advice of the fair damsel, he went to a place near the citadel, where he concerted with the public dancers, bear-leaders, and those who exhibit the tricks of monkeys; in consequence of which, while he was sitting, the next morning, drinking coffee with his father-in-law, the *Cûdhy*, they came before him; with a thousand congratulations, styling him cousin: the young merchant immediately scattered among them handfuls of money. The judge was astonished, and asked several questions. "My father," said the young man, "was a leader of bears and monkeys; such has been the profession

of my family; but having acquired some wealth we now carry on the business of merchants with considerable success." "But dost thou still," asked the judge, "belong to this company of bear-leaders?" "I must not renounce my family," replied the young man, "for the sake of thy daughter." "But it is not fit," exclaimed the judge, "that such a person should espouse the daughter of one who, seated on a carpet, pronounces the decisions of law: one whose pedigree ascends even to the relations of our prophet." "But, my good father-in-law," said the merchant, "recollect that thy daughter is my legitimate wife; that I value each hair of her head as much as a thousand lives; that for all the kingdoms of the world I would not consent to be separated from her." At last, however, a divorce was formally executed—the money which the merchant had settled was returned—and he, having applied to the parents of her who had contrived this stratagem, obtained the lovely damsel in marriage, and during a long succession of years, enjoyed the utmost conjugal felicity.

ON THE SCIENCE OF THE EGYPTIANS AND CHALDEANS.

PART VIII. [*Continued from No. XXXIX. p. 42.*]

It is remarked by Proclus, that the Egyptians indicated through their fables the secrets of nature; and Phornutus intimates that the mythological traditions concerning the gods are reconcileable to truth, as they were composed by the sages of antiquity, for the purpose of explaining the system of the universe by means of symbols and ænigmas. The more indeed we consider the mythology of the Egyptians, the more we shall be convinced, that the principal object of its inventors was to perpetuate the memory of philosophical researches, and of scientific discoveries. Even the Greeks, who did not possess the science of the Egyptians, were not always inattentive to the intentions of those from whom they principally borrowed the elements of their mythology. Their mixed fables, though generally overcharged with poetical embellishments, yet often continued to exhibit ingenious allegories, which related to agriculture, to astronomy, to physics, and to metaphysics. Thus in the fable which chiefly occupied the attention of the

initiated at Eleusis, Proserpine typified, in one sense, the corn, when it is sown under the surface of the ground; under another point of view the same goddess represented Nature, when the Sun descends to the lower hemisphere: and according to another interpretation, the allegory exhibited the soul, when it quits its pre-existent state, is united to the body, and becomes enamored of material pleasures, as the spouse of Pluto forgot the flowery vale of Enna, and took delight in the gloomy regions of *Hades*.

But although the fabulous deities of Greece were in many examples considered as merely allegorical personages, yet the mythology of the Greeks differed very considerably from that of the Egyptians. In Egypt, mythology was the offspring of mystery; and was at once the private interpreter of science, and the public organ of superstition. Its exterior appearance presented nothing to the eye of the stranger but a monstrous medley of extravagance, absurdity, and incongruity; but as Lucian has observed, though he himself too often forgot the precept, the ænigmas of the priests of Egypt ought not to be derided by the profane. Those priests, as we learn from Plutarch, placed sphinxes, not without a meaning, before the gates of their temples; while in the interior of the sacred colleges they explained their ænigmas; showed that their mythology was only a symbolical illustration of the system of nature; and in lifting the veil of allegory discovered to their disciples the revealed forms of truth and science. Mythology wore a very different appearance in Greece. There it became the favorite of the Muses, and the ally of the arts. Instead of being employed to express in ænigmas the discoveries and the systems of philosophers, it was altered and new-modelled to flatter the vanity, and to please the taste of a people, who were not unwilling to believe that their country had been the abode of the gods, and who were more attentive to the charms of poetry than versant in the truths of science. Greece was represented as the country where the mythic traditions had their origin; its kings and its heroes were easily admitted to the honors of the apotheosis; real and fictitious histories were confounded together; foreign and domestic events were blended into one mass of fabulous incongruity; and a new Pantheon rose on the ruins of the old, and was soon filled by a crowd of Grecian deities, who were far from bearing an exact resemblance to their prototypes in Egypt and the East.

From these observations it must, I think, be evident, that the fictions invented on the banks of the Nile were not the mere creations of sportive fancy, like those which owed^d their existence to the poets of Arcadia and Attica. The deification of mortals, as Herodotus testifies, was unknown in Egypt; though Euhemerus, to flatter the *divine* Ptolemy, had the impudence to assert the contrary, and though Diodorus had the weakness to believe him. The learned Egyptians, when they were not misled into the errors, of materialism and atheism, were monotheists in religion, and idealists in philosophy. They considered all the nominal deities of fable as mere symbols, which bore various meanings, according to the view which was taken of the allegorical histories by the initiated mythologists. Thus Osiris variously symbolised the active principle—the good principle—the Sun—the Nile—the patron of agriculture—the first planter of the vine. Isis represented sometimes universal nature—sometimes the passive principle—sometimes the air—sometimes the earth—sometimes the moon. We are therefore to recollect, that the same allegories, and the same symbols, expressed many different things; and served to illustrate now the science of the astronomer—now the system of the physiologist—and now the theory of the metaphysician.

It was my object in the preceding article of this essay to show, that the Egyptians were not altogether ignorant of the existence of those *elements of elements*, (*στοιχεῖα στοιχείων*) which our modern chemists assume to themselves the merit of having first discovered. I shall now proceed to corroborate my former statements by additional evidence; but as this evidence, which is chiefly derived from the Egyptian mythology, has been furnished by Greek and Roman writers, it is necessary that I make a few short remarks on the fidelity of their reports. I have then to observe that the writers of whom I speak, too generally endeavoured to assimilate the fables of Egypt to those of Greece and Italy. Osiris, for example, was the prototype of Dionysius and Bacchus, but the Greek god is not the same with the Egyptian, and the Latin drunkard differs from both. Buto has been improperly confounded with Latona, and Bubastis with Artemis and Diana. Orus and Apollo were both beardless youths, both were symbols of the sun, and both were born in a floating island, where the mother of the one sought refuge from the pursuit of Typhon, and where the mother of the

other fled from the persecution of the serpent Python; but Orus made love neither to the daughter of a river, nor to the daughter of the ocean—he neither fell from heaven, nor played on the flute, nor flayed alive an unhappy rival, nor pulled the ears of a Phrygian king for being a bad judge of music. The Egyptian mythology was of a graver cast than the Greek; and it is an error to consider the symbols of both under the same point of view. I have likewise to remark, that the Greeks and Romans, from their ignorance of some parts of science with which the Egyptians were acquainted, have frequently mistaken and misinterpreted the symbolical language in which the priests of Egypt alluded to their discoveries in physics and in natural philosophy. It is also to be regretted that the Greeks have reported the Egyptian fables without attention to order or method; that they have blended together different allegories; that they have confounded various Egyptian deities, not only with each other, but with those of Greece; and that they have never preserved the original orthography in writing the names of the stranger gods. We can only excuse them by saying, that when they made but one partition of the world between Greeks and Barbarians, they were not aware of the treasures of knowledge, which, during a long lapse of ages, had been amassed by nations that were grown old in civilization, before their own had escaped from the rudeness of a savage state. They never attained to that degree of perfection either in experimental philosophy, or in the abstract sciences, to which the Egyptians and the Chaldeans had arrived; and consequently it was not always possible for them to explain the allegorical language, in which the sages of Memphis and Babylon briefly and obscurely rather hinted than developed their systems and opinions.

Nothing seems more to have embarrassed the interpreters of the Egyptian ænigmas, than the symbolical language employed by the disciples of Hermes concerning almost every branch of chemistry and physics. Their doctrine concerning the elements appears especially to have puzzled the philosophers of Greece and Italy. Iamblichus tells us that, according to the Egyptians, the Sun presides over the elements of generation, and the Moon over those of production; and that four of those elements are masculine, and four feminine. (*De Mystic.* l. viii.) Long before the time of Iamblichus, the

Egyptian doctrine had been thus explained by Seneca:—*Ægyptii quatuor elementa fecere; deinde ex singulis bina, marem et fœminam. Aerem marem judicant, qua ventus est; fœminam, qua nebulosus et iners. Aquam virilem vocant mare; muliebrem, omnem aliam. Ignem vocant masculum, qua ardet flamma; et fœminam, qua lucet innoxius tactu. Terram fortio rem marem vocant saxa cautesque; fœminæ nomen assignant huic tractabili ad culturam.*—(*Quæst. Natur.* l. iii.) All this is prettily imagined, but much of it has no foundation in Egyptian mythology. According to Horapollo a hawk was the hieroglyphic for the winds; and if the wind were always masculine, how came Thueris, (*Typhonis pullex*) to typify the wind which blows from the south? Again it can scarcely be true that all water but the sea was called feminine, since Osiris symbolised the Nile; nor is it more consistent with mythology, that rugged ground, rocks, and stones, were denoted as masculine, since the barren border of Egypt next Arabia was typified by Nephthys, the incestuous wife and sister of the terrible Typhon.

Seneca states that out of each of the four elements the Egyptians made two,—the one masculine, and the other feminine. It is more natural to suppose that they represented fire, air, earth, and water, as resulting from the combinations of eight primordial elements, which they feigned to be masculine and feminine, because by their union they produced something different from themselves. It is impossible to conceive why rugged land should be called masculine, or why a distinction of sexes should be imagined between salt and fresh water; but when the chemist proves to me that both earth and water are compound substances, I can bear with the allegorical language in which the elements, by the union of which they have been produced, are called masculine and feminine. Thales, who had studied in Egypt, told the Greeks that fire, air, earth, and water, were not elements, but were compounded of elements. He told no more, probably because he knew no more; but that his Egyptian masters had formed a theory on this subject, a little less whimsical than that which is attributed to them by Seneca, I shall now endeavour to prove.

I have already observed, that the allegorical and enigmatical language of the Egyptians upon the subject in question must have been very embarrassing to most of the Greeks, who believed that fire, air, earth, and water, were primary and uncompounded ele-

ments. We cannot wonder then at the erroneous explanations which they have given of the symbols, which represented the component parts of the nominal elements. Air and water, for example, are composed of aeriform elements, which the moderns call *gases*. How these were expressed by the Egyptians in common language, it would be 'difficult' to say; but I can scarcely doubt that they were frequently indicated in the fables, where the Greek interpreters employ the words αἰθήρ, ἀνεμος, πνεῦμα, &c. It was, however, the fictitious deities of Egypt that were principally employed as the symbols of the natural elements; and the component parts of air and water seem to me to have been clearly indicated by these allegorical divinities.

Isis, according to the fable, fled from the persecution of Typhon, and concealed herself in the island of Chemmis, where she brought forth Orus and Bubastis, who were confided by their mother to the care of Buto. It is obvious, however, that Isis and Buto were in fact the same, and that this last was only one of the names assumed by the goddess *Myrionymos*. We have already seen in the last article, that Minerva, or Neitha, symbolised the air; and Plutarch tells us that Isis and Minerva were the same. Now according to the testimony of Porphyry, Latona, or Buto, was the symbol of the air, whether light or dark, under the Moon—*ταῦτ' δὲ ὑπὸ σελήνην φωτιζομένου καὶ σκοτιζομένου ἀέρος, ἡ Λητώ σύμβολον*. Thus Isis, under the names of Neitha and Buto, symbolised the air. Plutarch says that the Egyptians called the Moon the mother of the world, and assigned to her a nature composed of both sexes. She is impregnated, continues he, by the Sun, and again emits and disseminates the generating principles into the air. This author would have adhered more exactly to the Egyptian mythology, if he had written Minerva, or Neitha, instead of the Moon, and Pthah, or Vulcan, instead of the Sun. This appears evident from a passage in Horapollo, whose text, however, requires correction, as some words seem to be omitted, which I shall venture to supply. Ἡφαιστον δὲ γράφοντες [οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι] κύνθαρων καὶ γῦπα ζωγραφοῦσιν, Ἀθηναῖν δὲ γῦπα καὶ κύνθαρων. Δοκεῖ γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὁ κόσμος συνεστάναι ἐκ τε τοῦ ἀρσενικοῦ καὶ θηλυκοῦ. Ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς Ἀθηναῖς τὴν γῦπα, {καὶ τὸν κύνθαρων, ἐπὶ δὲ Ἡφαιστοῦ τὸν κύνθαρων καὶ τὴν γῦπα} γράφουσιν οὕτως γὰρ μόνον Θέων παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀρσενοθήλει ὑπάρχουσι. *The Egyptians indicate Vulcan by painting a*

beetle and a vulture; and Minerva by a vulture and a beetle; for it seems to them that the world is constituted out of what is masculine and feminine. They therefore paint the vulture and the beetle for Minerva, and the beetle and the vulture for Vulcan, because these alone of the gods are deemed by them to be of both sexes. Let us then correct the language of Plutarch, and read—the Egyptians called Minerva the mother of the world, and assigned to her a nature composed of both sexes; she is impregnated by Vulcan, and again emits and disseminates the principles of generation into the air. Pthah, or Vulcan, was feigned to be the father of the Sun, and was in fact the symbol of that *ignis fabrilis*, of which the Stoics have since said so much. This god was also the symbol of the ætherial fluid, which the Greek physiologists supposed to permeate the whole material world; nor can it be doubted that he was considered as the type of the living principle, and was thence called the father of the gods (ὁ τῶν θεῶν πατήρ). Chrysippus therefore and his followers only copied the Egyptians, when they taught, according to Diogenes Laertius, *that the whole world, being an animated and rational animal, has for its conductor the æther, which they say is the first god*—(οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὸν ὅλον κόσμον, ζῶον καὶ ἔμψυχον καὶ λογικὸν ἔχειν ἡγούμενον μὲν τὸν αἰθέρα, ὃ καὶ πρῶτον θεὸν λέγουσιν).

Neitha bore in many respects the same character as Ptah, and as he was said to be the father of the sun, so the goddess was feigned to be the mother of that luminary; and she is made to say, according to Proclus, *the fruit which I have brought forth is the sun*: (ὃν ἐγὼ καρπὸν ἔτεκεν ἥλιος ἐγένετο.) In the former the masculine is put before the feminine—in the latter the feminine before the masculine. Ptah symbolises æther, (otherwise the fabricating fire,) and air—Neitha, air and æther.

The Phœnicians seem to have taught a similar doctrine. According to Sanhoniatho, the first principles are symbolised by the wind Kolpias and Bau, night, or chaos; and their immediate offspring was Mot, slime. It appears, however, from a passage in Damascius (περὶ τῶν πρώτων ἄρχων) that this fable had its origin in the Egyptian mythology. • *Æther and air were the first: these are the two principles, out of which Oulomos, the intelligible god, was generated.* Oulomos is nothing else than the Phœnician word *עולם*, *oulom*, eternity, an age, time. Now Menes, the first fabulous

king of Egypt, and the institutor of the worship of Ptah, according to Herodotus, was also the symbol of eternity, or time; for the word **UENEH**, *mench*, which the Greeks wrote *mencs*, signifies eternity and time. Sanchoniatho himself seems to indicate what was meant by his wind Kolpias, for he also states the primary material cause to be *a dark and spirit-dilated air*: (ἀέρα ζεφώδη καὶ πνευματώδη; and this dark air was symbolised by Athor, the Ἀφροδίτη σκοτία, *Venus tenebrosa*, of the Egyptians.

The Greek mythologists seem not to have known what to make of the æther of the Egyptians and Orientalists. Hesiod has it that Erebus and night sprang from chaos, and æther and day from night. That light came out of darkness; and that night preceded day, was universally admitted in the East: but there the ætherial spirit was always put the first, and was held to be the primary agent employed by the divine and immaterial creator. Thus we have seen in the last article, that Cneph, the divine demiourgos, was represented with an egg in his mouth, to show that the universe had been called into being at the word of God; and Ptah, as Eusebius reports, sprang from Cneph, and was the material demiourgos, who, under the guidance of the supreme mind, gave form to matter and beauty to the world. The primordial wind, of which Sanchoniatho speaks, and which he calls Kolpias, or Kolpia, was no doubt written in the Phœnician text קול פי יה, *kol-pi-Jah, the voice or word of the mouth of Jah*; and the word for wind, or rather spirit, was of course written רוח, *ruach*, which Philo of Byblus, the Greek translator, would have rendered better by πνεῦμα than by ἀνεμος. It is this wind, or spirit, then, that came from the mouth of *Jah*, which was the primordial material principle of the Phœnician mythologist, and which the Egyptians called æther, and symbolised by their god Ptah. Nor are we to reject this explanation, because we find the creator called *Jah* by Phœnician idolators. The Tsabeans gave that sacred name to the sun and to the moon, the objects of their worship. What is the name given to the sun in the verses ascribed to the priests of Apollo at Clarus, but a corruption of *Jah*? -- φράζει τὸν πάντων ὑπατον θεὸν ἔμμεν λάω. Again, what is the ancient Egyptian masculine name for the moon, **IOH**, *Joh*, but an abbreviation of *Jehovah*, as we improperly pronounce יהוה, which in the ancient Jewish characters was written אלהים, *Jee*? It appears from Suidas, in voce Ὀρφεὺς, that this mytholo-

gist taught the true doctrine of the Egyptian theists; for according to him, *at the beginning the æther appeared in the world fabricated* (δημιουργηθείς) *by God.*

When we come down to later times, we find the Greeks still perplexing themselves about this æther. The poets openly said that mind is constituted of æther; and some of the philosophers argued that æther is the substance of the soul. Euripides has the following verses:

“Οθεν δ’ ἐκαστον εἰς τὸ σῶμ’ ἀφίκετο,
Ἐνταῦθ’ ἀπήλθε, πνεῦμα μὲν πρὸς αἰθέρα,
Τὸ σῶμα δ’ εἰς γῆν. SUPPL.

Plato, with most other Greek philosophers, taught that æther is that fine and subtle fluid, in which the celestial bodies perform their revolutions; and he seemed to consider it as a fifth element, more excellent than the rest, for he gave it the epithet of glorious, (ἐκκλήν.) Aristotle, in defining the substance of the soul, calls it a spirit enveloped in the seed and froth; and adds, that its nature is analogous to that of the stars. It is evident then that the Stagirite meant to say that æther is the substance of the soul.

We have seen that Isis, under the name of Buto, represented atmospheric air. Let us now consider the parts assigned to Orus and Typhon. According to Plutarch, Orus represented the season and mixtion (ἔρα καὶ κρᾶσις) of the ambient air which nourishes and preserves all things. What is it in the ambient air which can give it this character, if it be not the zotic element, or that part of its composition which we call vital air? The same Plutarch says in another passage, that the moon cannot always restrain the noxious influence of Typhon, who, though often vanquished, still returns to contend with Orus. Now it was in the marshes of the island of Chemmis, (compare Herodotus in Euterpe with Plutarch de Iside et Osiride,) that Buto concealed Orus from the researches of Typhon, who sought to destroy him while he was yet young and feeble. The allegory then signifies, that under the influence of the moon, and during the night, when vegetables give forth much of the azotic element, the due proportion of vital air is diminished, and most especially in wet and marshy ground. But the story goes on to say, that when Orus quitted the marshes of Chemmis, he overcame Typhon, and sent him bound to Isis, who immediately released him from his bonds. Here we have the vital air super-

abundant, but the balance restored between the zotic and azotic elements by Isis, the type, in this instance, of atmospheric air.

That Typhon was the symbol of the azotic elements in air and water, appears to be indicated in many examples. Plutarch assures us, that whatever is pernicious in nature was denominated a part of Typhon. The 'noxious wind of Arabia was termed Typhonic (Ἀραβικὴ πνοὴ ἢ Τυφωνική. Hesych.): the mephitic vapors arising from fens and marshes were called exhalations of Typhon (Τυφῶνος ἐκπνοαί): and typhus fevers are so named from the evil dæmon of Egypt.

It is apparently in repeating the doctrine of the Egyptians, that Plato distinguishes between two kinds of air, the one pure, and the other gross. 'We have seen that the ancients considered the superior part of the atmosphere to be free from noxious vapors, and that they denominated it æther; and the Greeks seem often to have confounded the pure part of atmospheric air with the æther of the regions of space which lie beyond it. Thus Empedocles has opposed Typhon, whom he calls Titan, to the æther, whereas it is manifest, that the distinction must have been originally made as existing between the zotic and azotic elements in common air.

Γαῖά τε καὶ πόντος πολυκύμων, ἡδ' ὕγρὸς ἀήρ,

Τίταν, ἡδ' αἰθήρ σφίγγων περὶ κύκλον ἅπαντα.

Earth, and the wave-abounding sea, then humid air, Titan, then æther binding a circle round the universe. Titan can have nothing to do here, and it is obvious that Empedocles confounded this giant, whose name is derived from the Phœnician word *tit lutum*, with Typhon. But Typhon's place is here made to be between air and æther. It seems to me that, in the Egyptian system of physics, from which Empedocles probably borrowed his doctrine, the azotic and zotic elements which compose air must have been intended to be indicated by Typhon and æther.

Horapollo says that the Egyptians indicated the world by painting a serpent biting its tail. Eusebius (Præp. Evang. l. i.) tells us that the Egyptians called the good dæmon Cneph, and that they represented him by painting a serpent within a circle, but adhering to the circumference. (The passage is sufficiently obscure, but this seems to me to be the sense of it.) Again Horapollo observes that a serpent was a symbol of the spirit which pervades the universe. The serpent then seems to be the symbol of that æther,

which at once envelopes and pervades the universe. Ptah appears to have typified not only this æther, but the principles of heat and of life, because these principles are supposed to exist in the æther and to be inseparable from it. This god, therefore, who was the symbol of the material *opifex mundi*, appears to have been sometimes confounded with the unbegotten and immortal Cneph, the spiritual Demiourgos. No doubt the hyloists of Egypt willingly confounded them; and this I suspect to have been the case with those who painted the circular serpent as the symbol of the Agatho-dæmon, whom they called Cneph. Here indeed it is evident that Cneph, symbolised by a serpent, (of which the scales represented the stars, according to Horapollon, and of which the convolutions, according to Clemens Alexandrinus, denoted the courses of the celestial orbs,) is himself the type of the æther. Now we find that one of the most venerated symbols in Egypt was that which typified Orus in conjunction with the Agatho-dæmon. A hawk was the symbol of the sun, but more particularly so when that luminary, in the astronomical sense of the fables, was represented by Orus. Thus we find from Strabo, (l. xvii.) that the city of Orus, no doubt from the frequent recurrence of his peculiar symbol, was called the city of hawks. Now let us hear Eusebius: τὸ πρῶτον ἐν θεϊότατον ὕψις ἐστὶν ἱέρακος ἔχων μορφήν, &c. *the first being that divine serpent having the form of a hawk, &c.* (that is, having the head of a hawk.) Here that deity who symbolises the season and mixture (rather the portion and element) of air preserving all things, is united with the Agatho-dæmon to show that he represented the vital principle, and zotic element, put into activity by the solar influence. In this same city of hawks, Orus was represented with a hawk's head, and as aiming a javelin at Typhon, symbolised by a hippopotamos, the type of water. (Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. iii.) Plutarch says that at Hermupolis was formerly shown an image of Typhon under the form of a hippopotamos, and on it a hawk was represented fighting with a serpent. Of these two last symbols the former represents the aqueous particles arising in pestilential exhalations from fens and marshes, dissipated by the rays of the sun, and replaced by purer air;—the latter typifies almost the reverse, and shows that the sun, when he draws up mephitic vapors from swamps and bogs, is at strife with the Agatho-dæmon, the symbol of pure and vital air.

That the gods of Egypt symbolised the elements cannot be doubted by those who have at all studied the mythology of that country. Plutarch (in Sympos. l. viii.) says that the Egyptians allow the intercourse of a male god with a mortal female, but that they do not think that conception and parturition can result from the commerce of a man with a goddess; and then he adds, what is deserving of attention: διὰ τὸ τὰς οὐσίας τῶν θεῶν ἐν ἀέρι καὶ πνεύμασι, καὶ τισι θερμότησι καὶ ὑγρότησι τίθεσθαι—*on this account, that the essences of the gods are placed in air, in spirits, (what the moderns call gases,) and in certain heats and humidities.* The same author observes elsewhere, that Osiris and Isis, after having been good dæmons became gods. Serapis, or Sarapis, the Egyptian Pluto, appears from a fragment of Porphyry to have had his share in the government of the elements: Μήποτε οὗτοι εἰσιν [οἱ δαίμονες] ὧν ἄρχει Σάραπισ, καὶ διὰ τούτων σύμβολον [αὐτοῦ] ὁ τρικάρηνος κύων, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς τρισὶ στοιχείοις, ὕδατι, γῇ, ἀέρι, πόνηρὸς δαίμων, οὗς καταπαύει ὁ θεός. *Perhaps these may be the dæmons whom Sarapis governs, and on account of these his symbol is the three-headed dog, that is the wicked dæmon in the three elements, water, earth, and air, which the god tranquillises.* This is not a bad specimen of the ignorance of the Greeks concerning the mystic meaning of the Egyptian symbols. The symbol of Serapis was not a three-headed dog, like the Cerberus of the Greeks, though Grecian sculptors have often represented it as such; but a yet stranger monster exhibiting a serpent's body convolved in the form of a cone reversed, with the head of a dog and of a wolf, and the head of a lion between them. Now the three-headed dog of the Grecian Pluto is a symbol without a meaning, whereas the three-headed monster of the Egyptian Serapis is full of meaning. Serapis was the type of *Sol inferus*, or the winter sun, when that luminary descends to the lower hemisphere. In the early ages when the winter solstice corresponded with the entry of the sun into the sign of Aquarius, the constellations, at that period opposite to him, were Hydra and Leo, with the dog on one side, and the wolf on the other. This was the state of the heavens then at midnight while the sun was in Aquarius, that Leo was at the meridian, the serpent, or hydra, extended its vast length along the half of the southern hemisphere, where the wolf was also seen to the east, and the dog towards the west. The Greeks therefore have destroyed the

meaning of the symbol in changing it. It is however obvious, from the passage which I have cited from Porphyry, that the elements water, earth, and air, were feigned by the Egyptians to contain evil dæmons; but it is more than probable that the mythologists meant nothing else by these evil dæmons than what the plainer speakers of modern times denominate azotic gases.

We have seen, in the last article, that Typhon was called the symbol of the sea, because, according to Plutarch, the sea was produced by fire, and Typhon was the proper symbol of fire. But Plutarch, as I have shown, must consequently have been mistaken, when he said that the Egyptians considered Typhon *πάν τὸ αἰχμηρὸν, καὶ πυρῶδες, καὶ ξηραντικὸν ὅλως, καὶ πολέμιον τῇ ὑγρότητι*—every thing arid, and fiery, and entirely of a drying nature adverse to humidity. Typhon was always the opponent of Osiris, who, in the physical sense of the fables, was one of the several symbols of vital air, whence whatever was healthy, as Plutarch styles it, in the winds, and seasons, and temperatures, was denominated a fluxion of Osiris. Typhon and the sea were held in abhorrence, because the mythologists taught that Osiris was destroyed by Typhon, as the waters of the Nile were lost in the sea. Now the whole of these fictions may be explained as follows: The worshippers of Ptah, whose tongue they said was a flame of fire, held that deity to be the *opifex mundi*; and in opposition to the partizans of Canopus, represented the *ignis fabrilis* as the great agent in nature, and the material principle of all things. But as the latent principle of heat cannot be developed without the presence of vital air, Ptah was represented of a double sex, and Neitha, likewise of a double sex, was associated with him, and after having been impregnated by him, disseminated the seeds of generation, as the fable has it, into the air. This Neitha, however, being the type of air and æther, it follows that, according to the Egyptian Vulcanists, the *ignis fabrilis*, in combination with the various elements which bear the form of gases, generated all things. Typhon, as I have attempted to prove, was everywhere opposed to Osiris, and was the symbol of all the azotic elements, of which the humid element, now called hydrogen gas, is one. This gas is, of all others, the most inflammable. In combustion it absorbs double its own volume of oxygen gas, and by its union with that element, is resolved into water. In this manner, then, the sea might be supposed to be produced by fire,

but Typhon was the type of the inflammable gas rather than of the fire by which it became ignited; and so far is this inflammable gas from being adverse to humidity, that in uniting itself with oxygen gas, it immediately takes the form of water, parting, no doubt, with much of its caloric, and losing in proportion its expansive force.

Upon the whole then, I think it must appear to the unprejudiced reader, that the fables of the Egyptians related not only to agriculture, and astronomy, but to physics and chemistry. I am aware that the tide of opinion is against me. I am still told that the ancients had neither telescopes nor microscopes, and therefore could know neither what is great in the heavens, nor what is minute on the earth: that they had no chemical apparatus, not even retorts and alembics; and that they formed their systems without making any appeal to experiment, the only index of truth in physics and in natural philosophy. In answer to the first of these objections I shall merely cite the following passage from Moscopulus: Κάτοπτρον, καὶ ἔνοπτρον, καὶ ἔσοπτρον, καὶ διόπτρα διαφέρουσι· κάτοπτρον μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἔνοπτρον ὁ λεγόμενος καθρύπτιος, ἔσοπτρον δὲ τὸ λεγόμενον φανάριον· ἡ δὲ διόπτρα, ὄργανόν τι τοῖς ἀστρονόμοις ἐστὶν ὑποῖος ὁ λεγόμενος ἀστρολάβος. I do not translate this passage, because there are no English words to correspond exactly with the names given to the instruments mentioned, yet they seem to be nothing else than different kinds of microscopes and telescopes. To the second objection I reply, that the Greeks were certainly acquainted with the art of distillation, since Dioscorides, as M. Dutens observes, not only speaks clearly of distillation, but employs the word *ambix*, which we have barbarised into *alembic*. (Dioscorid. L. 5.) Neither were the Egyptians ignorant of this art. M. Dutens has cited a passage from a manuscript work of Zosimus of Panopolis, which can leave no doubt about the matter. *Zosime*, says the French author, *recommande à ses élèves de se pourvoir de βίκος ὑελίνος, σωλὴν ὑστράκινος, λοιπὰς καὶ ἀγγύς στενύστομον; et plus loin; ἐπὶ ἅκρα τῶν σωλῆνων βίκους ὑέλους μεγάλους παχεῖς ἐπιθεῖναι, ἵνα μὴ ῥαγῶν ἀπὸ τῆς θερμῆς τοῦ ὕδατος*. That is to say, the experimenters are desired to provide themselves with a glass vessel, a shell tube, a plate (perhaps a kettle,) and a vase with a narrow mouth; great thick vessels of glass are to be placed over the tubes, that they may not be broken by the heat of the water. Had M. Dutens translated this passage, I think some of his readers would

have asserted less confidently than they have done, that the art of distillation was unknown in Egypt. In answer to the third objection, I refer to the example of Democritus, who, after having been educated in Egypt, *etatem*, says Petronius, *inter experimenta consumsit*.

I now come to a part of physiology, which occupied much of the attention of the early Greek philosophers, and to the consideration of which they were led by the example of the Phœnicians and Egyptians. The doctrine to which I allude is this: There are only four forms under which matter becomes cognisable to our senses, and all bodies are either aeriform, igneous, aqueous, or terrene. From this it follows that we ought to distinguish body from its elements; for though all bodies wear the form either of fire, or air, or earth, or water, yet fire, air, earth, and water, are not primary elements, but are themselves composed of elements which are prior to them. Again, these prior elements, which exist chiefly in a fluid, though sometimes in a solid, state, are themselves compounded of primary particles infinitely minute. These were denominated monads (*μονάδες*) by Pythagoras—smallest fragments (*θραύσματα ἐλάχιστα*) by Empedocles—motes (*ξυσματα*) by Democritus—atoms (*ἄτομοι*) by Ecphantus, &c. The doctrines of Pythagoras and of Democritus on this subject principally merit our attention.

Democritus, though not even the first among the Greeks who adopted the corpuscular system, was certainly its most able supporter. He seems to have attributed all primary qualities to atoms, such as figure, gravity, solidity, position, and magnitude; and these primary qualities he supposed to be as infinitely varied in atoms as they are in the bodies which are composed of atoms. Thus he thought that the figures of atoms are different in different elements, and that though their magnitudes are always infinitely minute, their relative proportions may be infinite in variety. Some atoms are spherical, some cylindrical; some take the shape of the cone, some of the pyramid, some of the cube; others exhibit unequal sides, and unequal angles, and others show themselves under every prismatic form, and under every irregular figure. It is evident, however, that it is absolutely idle to call such particles primary, or to denominate them atoms, since they must still be capable of infinite division. Imagine a sphere to be as minute as possible, still this sphere may be divided into two hemispheres. The

smallest pyramid may be truncated; the smallest cone admits of infinite sections. No cube can be so minute as not to be capable of containing a smaller sphere, and every sphere may contain a cone, and every cone a pyramid. In short, the *xusmata* of Democritus, since they have both magnitude and figure, cannot be atoms, which, as their name implies, admit not of section or division.

The numerical system of Pythagoras has often been treated as visionary, and even as unintelligible. It ought, however, to be recollected, that we have it transmitted to us in a very imperfect state, and that we cannot form a very adequate judgment of it from the reports of the Greeks, who in general did not understand it much better than the moderns. Even Plato, who in part adopted this system, though he expressed its doctrines in other words, and by other terms, has but too often added to the obscurity in which the immediate disciples of Pythagoras left it involved. We ought besides to recollect that Pythagoras brought this system from Egypt, where he might have been only imperfectly instructed in its principles by the philosophers of that country. I am aware, indeed, that some modern authors deny that this system had its origin in Egypt; but their opinion may be easily refuted on the authority of the Greeks themselves, and is therefore of no weight whatever.

The numerical system, of which we possess only the fragments, may be considered under two points of view—as it relates to physics, and to metaphysics. As it relates to the former, it probably served as the basis of the corpuscular philosophy; and as it relates to the latter, it has been made the foundation on which the ideal system has since been built up by Plato and his disciples. With this last system, which in my judgment is the most beautiful that ever was imagined, we have at present nothing to do. We are now to consider the Pythagorean doctrines as they relate to the material world. Let us, then, listen to the reports of the Greeks. Number, says an ancient writer cited by Stobæus, is a system of monads, or the progress of multitude from the monad, and the regress of combinations into the monad, (*ἐστὶ δὲ ἀριθμὸς συστήμα μονάδων, ἢ προποδισμὸς πλήθους ἀπὸ μονάδας, καὶ ἀναποδισμὸς εἰς μονάδα καταλλήλων.*) Iamblichus tells us, in his misty language, that Pythagoras defines number to be the extension and energy of seminal *ratios* in unity, (*τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὀρίζει ἐκτασιν καὶ ἐνέργειαν τῶν ἐν μοσίνδε σπερματικῶν λόγων.*) According to Hermias, the monad is

the principle of all things, out of the forms and combinations of which the elements are produced. Plutarch says that numbers, and the symmetries in them which are harmonies, were styled principles by Pythagoras; but that the elements which were constituted by them he called geometrical. Moreover he placed the monad and the infinite duad among principles: by the former he understood God and good—the Dæmon and evil by the latter, whence proceeded the material mass, which is the visible world. (Plut. de Placit. Philosoph.)

It would, however, only fatigue my readers were I to repeat all the fragments in Plutarch, Stobæus, Porphyry, Iamblichus, and other writers, concerning this system. Let us take a rapid view of the physical doctrines which it seems to announce. The monad then represents the material principle in unity—simple, and indivisible. It expresses this principle existing, as the Peripatetics would say, not in energy, but in power. The duad represents matter in actual being, and consequently expresses combination, depending indeed upon the operation of two principles, which the Pythagoreans called friendship and discord, (*φιλία καὶ νεῖκος*;) and which the moderns term attraction and repulsion. By the triad is to be understood the union of the monad and of the duad, and the production of the triangle, or of figure under its simplest form. The tetrad is the symbol of solidity, and consequently of the four-ensibie elements.

We have seen that the Pythagoreans named the elements, which result from numbers and proportions, geometrical. No doubt, then, the elemental symbols, which according to Diogenes Laertius were employed by Plato, had been borrowed from the Pythagoreans, who in their turn had obtained them from the Egyptians. Fire is represented by a regular pyramid, of which all the surfaces are equilateral triangles: this pyramid is consequently a tetraedron. Earth is symbolised by a cube, or hexaedron; air by an octoedron; and water by an éikosaedron. Plato also considered the dodecaedron as the symbol of the universe. (Alcibi. isagog. c. 13.) Now it is to be observed that these are the only regularly formed figures which can have solid angles, because the angles which unite their plane surfaces are less than 360°, or 4 right angles. Three angles of equal and equilateral triangles can form a solid angle, because they are each equal to only 60°; consequently 3 of these triangles joined

in the tetraedron will make a solid angle equal to 180° . In this way we find 4 angles of the octoedron, making a solid angle equal to 240° ; 5 angles of the eikosaedron, making a solid angle equal to 300° . Again, each angle of a square is equal to 90° , consequently 3 such angles joined can make a solid angle; and the solid angle of the cube is equal to 270° . The dodecaedron is comprehended under 12 regular and equal pentagons. Each angle of a regular pentagon is of 108° : 3 angles of such a pentagon will consequently make a solid angle equal to 324° . No other regular figures can make solid angles.

The Pythagoreans, or rather their Egyptian masters, chose the duad as the symbol of matter. But as 2 is the root, 4 the square, and 8 the cube, so the square of the material duad is represented by the tetraedron, and its cube by the octoedron. The hexaedron, or geometrical cube, consists of 6 squares, and 8 angles: but each of these squares may be equally divided into 2 isosceles triangles. The regular octoedron consists of 8 equilateral triangles, each of which may be divided into 2 equal scalene triangles. Thus then the elements, fire, air, and earth, bear proportions to each other in the same manner as these figures; and it would seem from the symbols mentioned above, that igneous particles can never form solid angles exceeding 180° , nor aerial particles solid angles exceeding 240° ; nor terrene particles solid angles exceeding 270° ; nor aqueous particles solid angles exceeding 300° .

What we call solidity in atoms is, perhaps, nothing else than their power of repulsion; and this repulsive power in atoms will be according to their mass and density. When the Pythagoreans represented fire by the tetraedron, they seem to have indicated that the distance between igneous atoms alters according to the square root of the intensity of the fire, or more properly its density. Again, when they symbolised air by the octoedron, they indicated that the distance between aerial atoms differs according to the cube root of the density of the air; and that if this density be supposed as 1, and that if air, according to this measure, be compressed into the 8th part of its actual expansion, its density will become as 8; and the distance between the atoms will be found to be inversely as the cube-root of 1 to the cube-root of 8, or as 1 to 2; whence it will follow, according to the Pythagoreans, that if air

be compressed into an 8th part of its usual expansion, the distance between its atoms will be diminished one half. •

I shall leave it to others to determine whether or not this reasoning be just, and to judge how far similar reasoning will apply to the other symbols representing earth and water. There are, however, some more remarks which I should wish to make concerning these figures.

I. The ancient philosophers of whom I speak seem to have considered the matter of heat and of light as the same; and perhaps they held this matter to be of the same nature with the magnetic and electric fluids. If I do not mistake, however, they understood all the sensible effects produced by these to result from the motion of their constituent particles. I must observe, too, in this place, that the ancient inhabitants of Italy, who had much intercourse with the Lydians, Phœnicians, and Egyptians, appear to have been aware that lightning is nothing else than the electric fluid; and Numa Pompilius, while he invoked the Elician Jove, elicited the fire from the cloud, and conveyed the harmless thunderbolt to the earth. Tullus Hostilius, less fortunate, or less scientific than Numa, probably perished in the same manner as the modern philosopher Richmann. With respect to the magnetic fluid, I cannot help thinking that the Phœnicians and Egyptians considered it as the matter of heat existing in a particular state, and exerting a peculiar influence. The former called the magnet *אבן חר-כול*, *abon hercul*, i. e. *lapis caloris universalis*; and the latter termed it *the bone of Or*, that is, *the power or strength of Or*, the symbol of light and heat.

But to return to my subject. If the primary particles of light and caloric be pyramidal, and be regular tetraedrons, we may make the following remarks: 1. No solid figure is more adapted to permeate the pores of bodies than the pyramid. 2. As, in a regular pyramid, the axe is a perpendicular drawn from the summit to the base, all other lines drawn from the summit to the base must incline to the axe; and as the figures of luminous pyramidal atoms are too minute to be individually discerned, a series of them will appear as a straight line extending in the direction of their axes. 3. As the power of the wedge is in its axe, the same is true of the regular pyramid, and each series of luminous atoms will always seem to proceed in the line of their axes, and consequently in a

straight line, unless when deflected by some extraneous cause.

4. It follows that when a ray, whether of light or of caloric, falls upon a surface capable of reflecting it, the angle of reflection will appear equal to the angle of incidence.

5. When a ray passes out of one medium into another, for example, out of air into water, it will continue to proceed in a straight line, if it fall perpendicularly, because the power of the pyramid being in its axe, the ray must be either reflected, or must pass on in a straight line, and as the pores of the water are too wide to hinder the passage of the ray, it must necessarily advance in the same direction as before : but if the ray fall obliquely on the water, the power of the luminous atom to advance will be weakened according to the angle which its axe makes with the surface, and this will augment as it proceeds in its course through the water.

6. When a ray falls perpendicularly upon any surface, all the powers of the luminous pyramidal atom are concentrated at its apex, and this apex will be as much as possible in contact with the surface ; but if the axe of the atom be inclined to the surface, all the sides of the pyramid will not be equally near to the surface, and the light descending from the upper side will not come into contact with it in the same instant or in the same point, as that proceeding along the lower side. In fact the upper line of light must be prolonged something beyond the apex of the pyramid in order to come into contact with the surface. Now if the surface be not a reflecting one, the powers of the luminous pyramidal atom will be divided, and some portion of the light will have penetrated the surface before the rest. Refraction therefore really begins before all the light of a ray has passed out of one medium into another.

7. When a ray is thus refracted, it will produce new sensations in us, which, it would seem, ought to be as various in intensity as the angles, which the lines of light form with our organs of vision, are different in magnitude ; but from the extreme minuteness of these angles they individually escape perception ; and it is only when we come to have distinct sensations produced by their continued gradations, that we class the rays in the order of the prismatic colors, from red to violet.

8. The matter of heat and of light being the same, though existing under different modifications, the heat, as well as the light, ought to be most intense in the line of light which is least deflected by the prism ; and this will be obviously true if the luminous atom be a regular pyramid,

because its power being in its axe, the other lines proceeding from the base to the summit will have the more power the more they are in the direction of the axe. The greatest intensity of heat is accordingly found in the red ray, which is that which is the least deflected. 9. It appears from the experiments of some modern philosophers, that the luminous atoms are capable of polarisation. Thus if under certain circumstances a luminous atom of a refracted ray be made to fall at 0 on a circle marked with the degrees, a spectator viewing it under a certain angle would see it in that position exhibiting a portion of light, which would continually diminish until it became altogether evanescent, if the atom were made to move round the circle through the different azimuths until it came to 90° . If, however, it were still made to move on, it would again gradually recover all its light when it came to the line of the meridian at 180° ; it would again become evanescent at 270° , and would not regain all its intensity until it returned to the point whence it set out. It seems to follow from these facts, that luminous atoms have sides and angles, and that it is owing to the manner in which these are turned by the polar attraction, that the atom varies its appearance in the experiment of which I have been speaking; and perhaps the phænomena can be best explained by supposing the luminous particles to be pyramidal.

II. The next regular polyedron which can make a solid angle is the cube. It was probably chosen as the symbol of the terrene element, because of all regular solid figures it is the most difficult to be moved, and because atoms under this form are the most capable of filling space.

III. There seem to be several reasons why the octoedron was chosen to symbolise aerial particles. The octoedron is formed by the junction of two pyramids, for when we join two developements of a tetraedron at a common base, we have the developement of an octoedron. Now if the attraction and repulsion of aerial atoms, (which we suppose to be octoedrons,) be in the line of their axes, and if they approach and touch each other only in the same line, the spaces between their sides will be void. But since we know that air is highly elastic, and capable of being either expanded or compressed greatly beyond its common state, we may presume that its atoms do not ever come into actual contact, but attract and repel each other at greater or smaller distances, and that upon this depends what we call the density or rarity of the air. If then

56 *On the Science of the Egyptians, &c.*

the equilibrium of an aërial atom be disturbed, and if by any concussion its axe be made to vibrate, it will produce by its attraction and repulsion a similar effect on the axes of its neighbouring atoms, and their sides will be raised and depressed alternately, until the vibration cease altogether. The sensation of sound is produced in us by the vibration of the aërial particles which are in contact with our organs of hearing; and I see no reason why these particles may not be octoedrons, since we can still account for all the phenomena while we suppose them to be such. But it is not improbable that the ancient philosophers may have chosen the octoedron as a symbol of air; *first*, because the distinct different sounds produced by the vibrations of a musical chord are contained in the octave; *secondly*, because if you count the rays of light from their least to their greatest distinct degrees of refrangibility, you will find, when you come to eight, that you have returned to the same coloured ray from which you began to count; *thirdly*, if we suppose aërial atoms to be diaphanous, the octoedron seems to be a figure peculiarly fitted for the regular transmission of light, since, if I mistake not, those crystals which are of this form do not admit of a double refraction.

IV. The universe was symbolised by the dodecaedron; and thence the Egyptians divided the zodiac into 12 partitions, each of which was subdivided into 30 sections, making in all 360 partitions of the circle; for the dodecaedron consists of 12 pentagons, and if each of these be divided into 5 triangles, the number of triangles will be 60, and if each of these triangles be again subdivided into 6, the whole number of triangles will amount to 360.

V. The moderns seem generally to consider the primary particles of water as spherical; but from the extreme minuteness of those particles we cannot ascertain their figure in any other way than by inference. I am indeed inclined to think from the crystallizations which they form when in a state of congelation, that they have plane sides and angles. The ancients believed them to have 20 sides and 12 angles. Why they did so I am unable to say. Perhaps in employing the tetraedron, the octoedron, and the eikosaedron, to represent fire, air, and water, they meant to indicate that the specific gravity of air is four times greater than that of flame, and that the specific gravity of water is twelve times greater than that of air. Perhaps, as all the faces of the eikosaedron are equilateral triangles, and as each of the angles of these triangles is con-

sequently equal to 60 degrees, they may have indicated that water assumes its solid state by shooting into crystals crossing each other in angles of 60 degrees, for this really happens in the formation of ice.

I have extended this article to too great a length already, but I cannot close it without observing, that the symbols of which I have been speaking appear to me to merit the attention of the philosopher. I call them symbols, because, according to the genuine doctrine of the schools in which they were employed, there can really be no material atoms existing under any form whatever, since there can be no such particles which are not capable of infinite division. But if matter be capable of infinite division, let the advocates of its existence point out where it is to be found. Can that exist any where but in the mind, which the mind can prove to itself to be capable of infinite division? The sciolist will think this question absurd—the philosopher, who must have often considered it, knows that it is equally difficult to solve and curious to investigate.

Naples, Nov. 11, 1819.

W. DRUMMOND.

COMMENTARY

On the Description of Ardent Fever given by Aretæus.

PART II.—[Continued from No. XI. p. 247.]

“First of all the patients foresee that they are about to quit this life, and enter upon another; and then they foretell to those present, things that are yet to come to pass.” Προγινώσκουσιν πρῶτιστά, καὶ τότε τοῦ βίου τὴν μεταλλαγὴν ἔπειτα τοῖσι παροῦσι προλγούσι τὰ αὐτῶν ἐσόμενα—What immediately follows is in the translation: “Nonnulli vero interitum eorum dictis fidem non habendam putant;” the original appearing in the text οἱ δὲ αὐτέους μὲν ἐσθ’ ὅτε καὶ ἄλλοι φασὶ δοκέουσι, words to which it appears impossible to affix any determinate meaning, or even to construe them according to the rules of the language. The emendation of Petit renders the passage at once intelligible, and is not to be regarded as conjectural, but a correction that in all future

editions ought to be received into the text. When the words ἄλλο φασὶ νοκέουσιν, altogether unintelligible, by a very slight alteration are rendered ἄλλοφάσσειν νοκέουσιν—*videntur delirare*, the sense is evident, and the present reading evidently appears to be an error in transcription or of the press. The Latin translation renders *ei* by *nonnulli*, whereas it ought to be *ii*, as it refers to the bystanders; and supposing the present text to be as printed, it appears altogether inexplicable how it could be rendered "*interdum eorum dictis fidem non habendam putant.*" The meaning of the passage evidently is, "that those exhausted by this disease, foreseeing the change that awaits them, and foretelling future events to those present, sometimes (ἐπ' ὅτε) appear to be delirious; but upon the occurrence of the events as foretold men are astonished:" τῇ ἀπόβασιν ὃς τῶν εἰρημένων θαυμάζουσιν ἄνθρωποι. "Some again address their conversation to some of the departed, they alone easily discerning them on account of their pure and highly refined sensation, the soul readily distinguishing and holding converse with those men with whom they are to associate; for before it was involved in turbid humors, and darkness, but after the disease has exhausted these humors, and removed the cloud from their eyes they perceive aerial beings, and the soul being freed from all corporeal impediments they become true Prophets: but those who have arrived at this degree of extenuation, and subtlety of intellect, do not long survive, the living power being already dissipated, or exhausted." In this concluding passage Petit has made two emendations which, like that already mentioned, deserve to be received into the text. Ἐρέουσιν τὰ τε ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ, he makes ὀρέουσιν; and ἐν ἰλυσὶ τοῖσι ὑγροῖσι ἔρη, he says *perhaps* should be altered to ἐν ἰλυσὶ τοῖσι ὑγροῖσι; and considering how very inaccurately the text of this chapter has been printed, there is every reason to believe the emendation right.

That conjectural emendations of the original text of an author ought to be very cautiously admitted, is true; but if we find the words of any writer do not convey a clear and distinct meaning, and cannot be brought within the common rules of construction of the language; if we find that by the alteration of one or two letters the sense appears consistent with the context, and the words thus altered fall within common rules, we may rest assured that the correction is just. Admitting then the emendations of Petit to be correct, the sense of the whole chapter would, generally taken, be as follows:

"An ardent and subtle fever pervades the whole system, but chiefly affects the internal parts. The respiration is hot, as if

proceeding from fire; fresh air is eagerly inhaled, with a longing for whatever is cold; the tongue is dry, the lips and skin are parched, the extremities comparatively cold, the urine largely tinctured with bile; the patient is restless, the pulse frequent, small and feeble; the eyes active, glazing, and slightly tinged with red, and the complexion is good. But if the disease continue to increase, all the symptoms become stronger and worse. The pulse is exceedingly small and quick, the dry heat is violent in the extreme, the judgment is disordered while the patient is ignorant of all that passes around him, there is great thirst, with an instinctive desire to touch any cold substance—the wall—vestments—the pavement—or cold fluid. The fingers are cold but the palms of the hands exceedingly hot, the nails are livid, the respiration hurried, a dewy moisture appears upon the forehead and neck. But if nature has arrived at the extreme degree of drought and heat, then is the hot changed into cold, and the parched state into a profusion of moisture. For things brought to extremity, are changed into their contraries. When therefore the bonds of nature are dissolved, this is the fatal termination. A sweat not to be checked flows from all parts of the body—the respiration is cold—much vapour exhales from the nostrils, the patient suffers no longer from thirst, for other parts are dried up, except the mouth and stomach, the organs that suffer from thirst, the urine is thin and watery; the bowels for the most part in a state of constipation, but in some there are scanty bilious stools.—A great redundancy of superfluous fluid prevails, the very bones undergo colliquation; and, as in a river, *which deposits floating substances on its banks*, there is a current towards the external parts.

State of the Mind. The senses are highly acute, the powers of the mind active, and the sick are disposed to foretell future events. First of all they foresee that they are about to enter upon another life, and then they foretell to the bystanders things yet to come to pass. They indeed sometimes think these vaticinations the effect of delirium; but upon the occurrence of the events foretold men are astonished. Some also address their conversation to those already departed from this life, readily discovering their presence by their quick and refined sensation; the soul easily distinguishing and holding conversation with the men with whom they are to associate; for before it was immersed in turbid humors and darkness, but after the disease has exhausted these humors, and removed the cloud from their eyes, they perceive aerial beings; and the soul being now

disengaged from all corporal impediments they become true Prophets. But those who have arrived at this degree of exhaustion of humors and refinement of intellect do not very long survive, the powers of animal life being already dissipated."

The Greek text of Aretæus was from the manuscript in the French King's Library, corrected for the press by Goupylus, a learned Physician, in the year 1554, and the work was printed by the celebrated Turnebus, one of the first Greek scholars then in Europe. Yet if the foregoing remarks be just, the text of the chapter which is the subject of this paper, will appear to have been very inaccurately printed, and the Latin translation re-published under the sanction of Henry Stephens, and afterwards of Bôerhaave, is intolerably bad.

From this we may see the great propriety of a more strict examination of the text of the Greek medical authors, and a careful examination of the manuscripts by readers qualified to report upon the proper punctuation, and what mistakes may have occurred through the ignorance or haste of transcribers. The text of Hippocrates might thus be in a great measure restored; and many corrections might be made of all the Greek authors down to the 12th century, when works of merit in the profession were no longer printed in that language.

From this part of the writings of Aretæus, it appears that the immortality of the soul was a doctrine well understood and firmly believed in his time, being indeed a principle assumed in ancient philosophy as demonstrably true. "*Morte carent anima*," says Ovid in his recapitulation of the tenets of Pythagoras; and although some modern writers have attempted to show from some passages, in the works of Cicero, that he doubted the fact of the soul's immortality, certain it is that the Peripatetics, whose philosophy he studied and preferred, entertained no doubts on the subject, holding the human soul to be an emanation from the deity in its very nature indestructible.

The opinion has prevailed among the learned of all ages, as well as the unlearned, that upon the approach of death the soul exerts a more divine energy, and that in many cases the vaticinations of dying men are true. Homer tells us, that Patroclus dying foretold the fate of Hector, and Hector in his turn foretold that of Achilles, the event in each case proving the truth of the prediction. Cicero says that upon the approach of death the soul acquires new powers, to be much increased as

soon as it is disengaged from the body. "Viget autem, et vivit animus, quod multo magis faciet post mortem, cum omnino e corpore excesserit: itaque appropinquante morte, multo est divinius. Nam id ipsum vident, qui sunt morbo gravi et mortifero affecti, instare mortem. Itaque his occurrunt plerumque imagines mortuorum: tumque vel maxime laud student, eosque qui secus quam decuit vixerunt, peccatorum suorum tum maxime pœnitent. Divinare autem morientes etiam illo exemplo confirmat Posidonius: quo affert *Rhodium* quendam morientem, sex aequales nominasse, et dixisse qui primus eorum, qui secundus, qui deinceps moriturus esset." This passage from Cicero's work *de Divinatione*, manifests no doubt of the soul's immortality, but the contrary; and the error of Blacklock and others, who say that he did express such doubts, arises from their taking the opinions of one of the persons he introduces in a dialogue for his own. We find that *Jacob* on his death-bed desired his sons to assemble around him that he might declare to them the things that should befall them in the latter days; and *Moses* on the approach of death also foretells future events to the children of Israel.

Sometimes in the delirium of fever, the patient appears to see events passing at a great distance, an instance of which is recorded by Margaret of Navarre, as having happened to her mother, who being dangerously ill and quite delirious, suddenly exclaimed, raising herself from the bed, "See how they fly! my son has the victory!—Ah, my God! raise up my son, he is upon the ground!—Do not you see the Prince of Condé lying dead in that grass?" Next day, when *Mons. de Losses* brought the account of the battle of Jarnac, anxious to inform the Queen of the happy event, he caused her to be awakened to hear the news; when she heard them she complained that her sleep had been unnecessarily disturbed, as she knew it all very well.

When we find a physician of eminence describing, amongst the natural symptoms of disease, that abstraction of the soul from the body and foreknowledge of future events which we suppose to be conferred upon beings of a superior order, we cannot doubt that the immortality of the soul was then an established article of faith; for not the least appearance of hesitation is manifested by the author, when he tells us that the living powers being totally exhausted, the soul sees those spirits with whom it is about to associate, "millions of whom," our great poet informs us, "walk the earth, unseen, both when we wake and when we sleep." The expression which *Arctæus*

uses μεταλλαγή τοῦ βίου is not adequately rendered by *migratio de vitâ*, or *departure from this life*: it strictly implies a *change of the manner of life*; and as, according to the Philosophy of Ancient Greece, the soul was held to be an emanation from the Deity, it was consequently believed indestructible in its nature.

LETTERS ON THE ANCIENT BRITISH LANGUAGE OF CORNWALL.

No VI.—[Continued from No. XL. p. 270.]

LETTER IX.

COMPOUND WORDS, &c.

AFTER having examined, in my last letter, the different ways, in which words are disguised, I may be permitted in this to proceed with some remarks more immediately connected with the Cornish dialect. The first suggestion however that occurs, is how far researches into a subject of the kind may be attended with some utility.¹ It is indeed true, that Cornish is not of that importance which attaches to the ancient and modern tongues, that may be called classical. I understand by the term, those whose standard has been fixed, and have now become valuable by the productions of eminent writers. As these characteristics certainly do not be-

¹ Dr. Borlase thus expresses himself in the Preface to his Cornish Vocabulary: "In the present language of my countrymen, there are many words, which are neither English, nor derived from the learned languages, and therefore thought improprieties by strangers, and ridiculed as if they had no meaning; but they are indeed the remnants of their ancient language, esteemed equal in purity and age to any language in Europe."

"The technical names belonging to the arts of mining, husbandry, tishing and building, are all in Cornish, and much oftener used, than the English terms for the same things. The names of houses and manors, promontories, lakes, rivers, mountains, towns and castles in Cornwall, especially in the Western parts, are all in the ancient Cornish. Many families retain still their Cornish names. To those, therefore, that are earnest to know the meaning of what they hear and see every day, I cannot but think that the present Vocabulary, imperfect as it is, (and as all vocabularies, perhaps are at first,) will be of some satisfaction."

(Antiquities of Cornwall, p. 375.)

long to the Cornish, it can be interesting only as an object of antiquarian and etymological research. These are, however, points of the highest consequence to the philosophical inquirer into the origin, and the history of nations, and sometimes they are the only confirmation that we can obtain of our conjectures respecting the state of former days. For instance the etymology of the Cornish, as having been derived from several foreign tongues, remarkably confirms the truth of history concerning the several nations who have at any time either traded or settled in the west. The marks which they have left on the language attest the truth of history. It is owing to this mixture of foreign idioms, that the Cornish has so much less of an original cast, than the other British dialects. An acquaintance with Cornish remains, may also be singularly useful in the study of antiquities, especially of such as are connected with the ancient Britons. It must, however, be acknowledged, that a great part of the interest it excites, is of a local nature; but I apprehend that this objection also applies to every other tongue, that has never enjoyed any extensive circulation. It cannot fail to be important, as connected with general literature, to add to its accumulated stores, by preventing any particular dialect from sinking into oblivion, and to exhibit its excellencies and defects. If attempts to preserve the aboriginal languages of America and the Southern Islands, are commendable, how much more so must be the endeavour to form an acquaintance with the scattered fragments of the speech of their ancestors!

The most striking utility of Cornish to general readers, is the helps which it affords in explaining the local names of men and things. There is no part of the world where the proper names are so entirely original as in Cornwall; and there is in them an extraordinary variety, which is occasioned by the particularly diversified scenery of the county. As to English local names in Cornwall, they are but few, and even those are evidently of modern date. To a stranger travelling there, and indeed to almost all the natives, those Cornish words are as entirely destitute of meaning, as if they were Sanscrit. It is not perhaps generally proper to learn the language of any country, merely for the sake of understanding the nomenclature of its topography; but to natives and residents, an acquaintance with it to a certain degree, is desirable. It enables one at once to guess at the locality of any place, and on looking over a map, to determine the face of the country from the names; and even where the inferior objects of buildings, woods, mines, and enclosures have vanished, we are enabled to assign them their former positions, without the assistance of history, or even of tradition. A Cornishman, unacquainted with these several terms, is in fact to be compared to one, who is a stranger in the land of his ancestors; and while he mentions any particular spots,

it must continually appear to him as if he had succeeded to an unknown race of men, and was expressing the sounds of a dead and barbarous tongue.

I have had occasion to mention in several of my former letters, that the Cornish is not guttural, and that it is much more harmonious than any of the other British dialects. It is indeed so far from being disagreeable, that if it had been cultivated by a polished people, it would have been particularly smooth and elegant. It has none of that frequent concourse of consonants, which so much disfigures some of the modern languages; and I have no doubt that a foreigner would find it much easier to articulate any given number of Cornish than English words.

The Cornish derives a particular advantage from the expressiveness of its proper names; as indeed it is singular that there are few or no places in Cornwall, whose names are not connected with some local circumstance. And yet could this have been the nomenclature of a barbarous people? Their accuracy in this respect forms a striking contrast with the fanciful, unmeaning, and sometimes ridiculous appellatives of modern discoveries. The Cornish ought to be a pattern to our modern navigators. *Valvenna, the old moor*; *Hendra,¹ the old town*; *Handue, God's enclosure, or the church-yard*; *Meantol, the holed stone*; *Portreath, the sandy core*; *Tregoose, the wood farm*; *Trenance, the village in the valley*; these are a few from some hundred proper names, and which are all equally expressive.

After so many revolutions, religious as well as political, it is really surprising that those names have not only been retained, but that they have been so little altered. Conquerors and new settlers, and even the descendants of the natives, in general either adopt new, or so corrupt the old names, that they can be no longer recognised. This happened in the nomenclature of Europe after the subversion of the Roman Empire, as the like has more recently taken place in the European colonies in the two hemispheres, in the almost unaccountable omission or perversion of native names. But the Cornish appellations of the hills and vallies still remain to attest the abode of former generations, and by these faint but lasting memorials, they remind their posterity, that the country is still the same, and that they inhabit the very spots, which were the scenes of the residence and of the pursuits of their forefathers.

A few Cornish names, however, seem to have given way to modern ones, especially in those of parishes, as in St. Ives,

¹ There are exceptions when the substantive is not placed before the adjective, as in this *Hendra*, from *Henn, old*, and *Tre, a town*, or rather village; or in *Camelford*, from *Cam, crooked*, *Hel, a river*, and *Ford, a passage*.

St. Mawes, and St. Just; but even these are very ancient, as they must be referred to that remote period, when Christianity was first introduced, and the Cornish, from religious veneration, gave the names of their Saints to the new division into parishes. The words have also been very differently pronounced at different periods, and this has occasioned some of that diversity in the orthography, which I have already noticed; and there is also a disposition to Anglicise Cornish names, whenever they bear any resemblance to English ones, as in Port Isaah, *The Lizard*, Pendeennis, and Brown Willy, instead of *Porth iz-ick, The village of corn creek; Laxherd, The projecting land; Pen-dinas, The hill of fortification; and Brae-an-uellon, The hill of high crags.*

The Cornish abounds in compound words, as may be seen in the different names of places. They are generally formed of two words, and, occasionally, of three; but they consist of only from two to four syllables. Thus we have Chyprase, *the house in the meadow*; Clowance, *the valley of echoes*; Tre-mabe, *the boys' village*; Killi-grew, *the eagles' grove*; Lan-liadron, *the thieves' valley*; Re-sugga, *the moist valley*; Killi-gorrick, *the grove on the water-side*; Pen-callinick, *the hill of the holly trees*; and Menadowa, *the rocky place by the water*. Some are contracted into a monosyllable, as Choone for Chy'-un, digammated from Chy-goön, *the house on the common*; and some of three syllables are made into two, as Kill-ock, from Killy-oke, *the oak grove*. Few languages could express so much within so small a compass, or with so much smoothness. Among the compounds of three words are the following: Cois-pen-hayle, *the wood at the river's head*; Hel-men-tor, *a rocky hill on the moor*; Pen-hal-veor, *the head of the great moor*; Tre-gust-ick, *the wooded house by the brook*; Tre-men-hir, *the long stone village*; Tin-tag-el, *the good fortification on the moor*.

I observed in my last letter, how very often Cornish words are digammated. This was done chiefly to avoid any collision or harshness of sounds, and for that reason consonants were removed, and the vowels coalesced, as we have just seen in Choone, from Chy'-un and Chy-gün; and again, Ar-allas, *upon the cliff*, and Ar-owan, *on the rivulet*, are put instead of War-allas and War-owan; while Bus-var-gus, *the house on the top of the wood*, and Clow'ance, are put instead of Bus-war-gus, and Clow-nance. In short, it seems to have been the genius of the language to soften all asperities, and at the same time to retain its manly character by not admitting an unnecessary concourse of vowels. By not removing the superfluous consonants, how very disagreeable would be

¹ I recollect being once called up very early, by a new servant, a native of Plymouth, as *Tom Genys* wanted me; but on coming down, I was surprised to find, that I had been sent for to the village of *Tremenna*.

the corresponding English compounds, *Meadhouse*, *Thieves' Vale*, *Woodfarm*, *Wood-top moor*, *Moorstone hill*, &c. This harshness is owing to our retaining all the consonants in our composition, and which makes it almost impossible to compound words in many cases, especially when they are monosyllables.

The Greeks, like the Cornish, softened their compounds by dropping certain letters, as in *ιοπλόκαμος*, *ιππόδαμος*, *λιγυφθόγγος*, and *ποδάρκης*. The disadvantage of Greek compounds, however, is, that the words become of an immoderate length, and occupy nearly as much room as if they had been expressed in a separate form.

The Cornish is free from this defect, as the greater part of its compounds are only of two, and a few are at the most of three syllables. It is thus that it combines the advantages of the Greek and the English compounds, without incurring the length of the former, or the harshness of the latter. Contrary to the Greeks, whose compounds consist of only two words, the Cornish have sometimes three, and yet they neither lengthen the word too much, nor render it disagreeable, as in *Bud-och-vean*, *the little oak haven*; *Tre-van-nance*, *the village in the great valley*, &c.

The Cornish compounds are mostly formed of two monosyllables, which are occasionally softened, as has been said before, by the removal of the redundant letters, as in *Clowance*, &c., while others again are connected by the particles *a*, *an*, *u*, and *y*, or by *ar*, *bar*, *gan*, *vor*, or *war*.¹ All these occur in, *Menadowa*, *the rocky place by the water*; *Chy-an-dour*, *the house on the water side*; *Chy'n-hale*, *the house in the moor*; *Lau-y-un*, *the church on the downs*; *Ar-allas*, *upon the cliff*; *Chi-bar-bes*, *the house on the high green*; *Chi-vor-lo*, *the house by the great pool*; *Tre-gan-horn*, *the iron house*; and *Ty-war-'n-haile*, *the house on the moor*. Sometimes also letters are added for euphony, as *Guste-vor*, for *Gus-vor*, *a large wood*; and *Lant-eglos*, for *Lan-eglos*, *the inclosed church*. This use of the *t* to harmonize sounds is the same as in the French *ya-t-il*?²

Greek proper names are often nothing more than possessives, as in *Ἀλιάρης*, *Κήρινθος*, *Πελεδόν*, the synonyms to which are rendered in Cornish by two words, as *Mor-va*, *a place by the sea*; *Tremelzy*, *the honey farm*; and *Ellen-glaze*, *green elms*. The Cornish compounds sometimes consist of a substantive and an adjective; but more commonly of two substantives, with or without a connecting particle. This is owing to the paucity of Cornish adjectives, as *Nan-killy*, *Carn-glaz*, *Pen-trivel*, and *Tre-vor-order*; all of which, if in Latin, would be thus expressed, *Vallis nemorosa*,

¹ To these may be added, *ga*, *gor*, *bartha*, and *wartha*, as in *Tregaminion*, *the house of stones*; *Triegorrich*, *the house by the brook*; *Trebartha* and *Trewartha*, *the upper house*.

² Is not the original termination of the verb in this instance retained, rather than a letter arbitrarily inserted for Euphony? Ed.

Rupes viridis, Caput equinum, and Domus palustris. This is the same idiom as that which so frequently occurs in Hebrew, and from the same cause, and which Grammarians call the *regimen*, as אֶרֶץ תִּפְנִי, *a delightful land*, (Mal. iii, 12.) שֶׁקֶר-דְּבַר, *lying*, (Prov. xiii, 5.) בְּרֵכֶת טוֹב, *a good blessing*, (Prov. xxiv, 25.)

Several lists have been made of the Cornish proper names, some of which have received different meanings; but this is not surprising, when we reflect, that when the translator has been at a loss, he may have conjectured at a meaning from actual localities; and on the other hand, it is well known how difficult it is to trace a multiplicity of proper names, in a language of which only a few scattered fragments remain, and which is now totally extinct. Many of those appellatives also can undoubtedly bear different significations, yet with all these disadvantages, I apprehend that it would be less arduous to interpret any given Cornish nomenclature, than that of the Greek places in the second Book of the Iliad.

Such then seem to have been some of the excellencies by which the Cornish language was distinguished, even in the rude and imperfect state of the people by whom it was spoken. It is then evident that it would have been susceptible of a high degree of cultivation, and might possibly have even surpassed many of those tongues, which, at different periods, have been the vehicles of useful science and elegant literature, and afforded the means of communication between numerous assemblages of men. But it is with languages, as it is with individuals; it is not always those who originally had the best pretensions, who are advanced to eminence and fame. The language of a large and powerful population becomes an object of attention, and in the course of ages it is progressively improved, till it receives the highest degree of perfection, which, in its nature, it can admit. But the dialect of a small and insulated race, is deprived of those external supports; and whatever may be its original merits, it is left to itself, till it decays unknown and unregretted, and is finally merged and lost in its more powerful neighbours. The Cornish was the least unmixed of the British dialects; but it was at the same time the most harmonious and the most improveable. It is indeed to be lamented, that after so many ages, and the convulsions of so many political storms, none of these dialects should have become the tongue of some great European nation. I cannot also but express my regret that the one which I have now been endeavouring to elucidate in these letters, should have been that which has been the first extinct, which has been the least cultivated, which has been spoken by the smallest tribe, which the fewest attempts have been made to preserve, and which, but for a few philological antiquarians, would have entirely sunk into oblivion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

List of the principal Books of the Duke of Marlborough's Collection at White Knights, sold by Mr. Evans, Pall Mall, in June, 1819. With prices and purchasers.

PART II. [Continued from No. XL. p. 394.]

FOURTH DAY'S SALE.

Octavo et Infra.

- Brumoy Theatre des Grecs, 13 vols. Papier Velin, gravures avant la lettre, red morocco, by Derome. Par. 1785. 10*l.* *Payne.*
 Burnet's History of his own Time, 4 vols. large paper, elegantly bound in green morocco. 1809. 15*l.* 15*s.* *Lord Yarmouth.*
 Carmina Quadragesimalia ab Ædis Christi Alumnis composita, 2 vols. green morocco. Oxon. 1723. 1*l.* 13*s.* *Ward.*

Quarto.

- Brant Stultifera Navis, first edition, wood cuts, red morocco. Basil, Bergman de Olpe, 1497. 1*l.* 13*s.* *Triphook.*
 — Navis Stultifera a Badio illustrata, wood cuts, red morocco, with joints, per Nicol Lamparter, 1406 (sic) 2*l.* 10*s.* *Triphook.*
 Stultifera Navis, wood cuts, red morocco. Parisiis, sine anno. 3*l.* *Triphook.*
 Brant Carmina in Memorabiles Evangelistarum Figuras, red morocco. 1502. 2*l.* 10*s.* *Triphook.*
 Bryant's New System of Ancient Mythology, 3 vols. fine impressions, with the plate of Cupid and Psyche, by Bartolozzi, and a duplicate inserted by Sherwin, red morocco, with joints. 1775. 8*l.* 18*s.* 6*d.* *Payne.*

Folio.

- Boccaccio il Decamerone, (Venezia) per Christofal Valdarfer di Ratispona, MCCCCLXXI. 918*l.* 15*s.* *Longman.*¹

Notwithstanding the publicity of the extraordinary sum which this Book produced at the Roxburghe Sale, all researches throughout Europe to procure another copy have proved entirely fruitless. This Volume still continues to be the only known Perfect Copy of this Edition, and is, in all probability, the only copy which will ever be offered for public sale. Its unparalleled rarity, however, is not its only recommendation, as it contains many important Readings which have not been followed in any subsequent Edition.

¹ This celebrated Book, for which the Duke had given 226*ol.*, is now in the rare and splendid collection of Lord Spencer.

- Boccaccius de Montibus, Sylvis, &c. first edition, fine copy, red morocco, with joints. Venet. Vindelin de Spira. 1473. 4l. 1s. *Payne.*
- Boetius. The Boke of Consolation of Philosophie. Atte requeste of a singular frend and gossib of myne, I, William Caxton, have done my debuoir and payne tenprynte it. Imperfect, bound in russia, without date. 22l. 11s. 6d. *Triphook.*
- Bretaigne, les Grandes Croniques de, black letter. Paris, Galliot du Pré, 1514. 4l. 14s. 6d. *Booth.*
- Brusonii Facetiarum Libri Septem. Original and only complete Edition, all others being castrated, blue morocco. Romæ, per Mazochium, 1518. 27l. 10s. *Longman.*
- Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy, with a plate representing Melancholy, by Albert Durer, and a copy from it inserted, fine copy. Oxford. 1632. 4l. 16s. *Jarris.*

FIFTH DAY'S SALE.

Octavo et Infra.

- Catherine Quene of Englande's Prayers or Meditations, wherein the mind is stirred paciently to suffre all afflictions here, &c. black letter, first edition, red morocco, T. Berthelette. 1545. 3l. 7s. *Triphook.*
- Ciceronis Opera Omnia, 10 vols. very fine copy, red morocco. Elzevir, 1642. 6l. *Lepard.*
- , ex recensione Ernesti, 8 vols. Halæ Sax. 1774. 3l. 10s. *Hayes.*
- Cicero de Philosophia, Pars Prima, large paper, russia, rare, Aldus, 1541. 6l. 15s. *Appleyard.*
- Clarendon's History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars of England, 6 vols. large paper, elegantly bound in blue morocco, with joints. Oxford, 1807. 21l. *Newton.*
- Conciones et Orationes ex Historicis Latinis excerptæ, blue morocco. Amst. Elzev. 1652. 1l. 3s. *Hibbert.*
- Alia editio, green morocco, with joints, uncut. Amst. Elzev. 1662. 1l. 10s. *Payne.*
- Alia editio, blue morocco, with joints, uncut. Amst. Elzev. 1672. 4l. 19s. *Hibbert.*
- Confession of the true and Christian Fayth, according to God's Word and Actes of Parliament, holden at Edenburghe, the 28th of Januarie, 1581, being the 14th yere of the King's (James VI.) reigne, black letter, blue morocco, rare. Lond. by R. Waldegrave. 5l. 5s. *Longman.*

Quarto.

- Casas, Brevisima Relacion de la Destruycion de las Indias: coleccionada por el Obispo don Fray Bartolome de las Casas, o Casans, de la Orden de Santo Domingo, 1552. Treyn ta Proposiciones

muy Juridicas, 1552. Una Disputa entre el Obispo, Bartolome de las Casas y el Doctor Gines de Sepulveda, 1552, fine copy, russia, rare. 7*l.* Longman.

Catechisme, That is to say, aue commune and catholick instruction of the Christin people in materis of our catholick faith and Religioun: set furth by John, Archbisshop of Sanct Androus, at Edinburgh, the 26 Day of Januarie, the zeir of our Lord, 1551, black letter, fine copy, blue morocco, rare. Prentit at sanct Androus, 1553. 35*l.* 14*s.* Heber.

Catherinæ Senensis Vita ac Miracula selectiora formis æneis expressa, very fine impressions. Antv. apud Philippum Gallum, 1603. 4*l.* 4*s.* Hibbert.

Calzii Emblemata varia, blue morocco. Rott. 1627. 2*l.* 3*s.* Triphook.

Caylus Recueil d'Antiquités Egyptiennes, Etrusques, Grecques, et Romaines, 7 vols. very fine copy, red morocco. Par. 1752. 18*l.* 5*s.* Triphook.

Centeno, Historia de Cosas del Oriente, russia, scarce. Cordova, 1595. 9*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* Payne.

Cervantes' Don Quixote, by Jarvis, 2 vols. with very fine impressions of Hogarth's, Vanderghucht's, Hayman's, Coypell's, and the plates from the Madrid edition inserted, green morocco, with joints. 1742. 22*l.* 1*s.* Jarvis.

Charlemaigne. Chronique de Charlemaigne des douze Pairs de France et de Fierabras, black letter, wood cuts, very rare, imperfect at the beginning. Lyon, 1486. 3*l.* 18*s.* Utterson.

Charlemaigne, la Conqueste du Grant roy Charlemaigne des Espaignes. Et les vaillances des douze pers de France. Et aussi celles de Fierabras, black letter, wood cuts. Lyon, 1501. 9*l.* Hibbert.

Chancer's Canterbury Tales, with Notes and a Glossary, by Tyrwhitt, 2 vols. large paper, with Mortimer's plates inserted, russia. Oxf. 1798. 4*l.* 11*s.* Cattley.

— Plough-man's Tale, with a short exposition of the words and matters. Lond. by Macham, 1606. 4*l.* 10*s.* Triphook.

Folio.

Cathon. The Booke called Cathon, translated oute of Freusshe in to Englysshe, by William Caxton; wanting signature c, russia. Caxton. 1483. 22*l.* 1*s.* Triphook.

Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles, wood cuts, black letter, red morocco. Paris, A. Verard, sans date. 9*l.* 9*s.* Triphook.

Chastysing of Goddes Chyldren. The Prouffyttable Boke for mannes soule, and right comfortable to the body, and speecyally in aduersitee and tribulacyon, Caxton, without date. The Tretyse of the Love of Jhesu Christ, Wynken de Worde, without date, 2 vols. in 1, fine copies of two books of very great rarity. 32*l.* 11*s.* Lord Aylesford.

Chaucer's *Troilus and Creside*, fine copy, russia, wants one leaf, signature p. II from the Towneley Collection, very rare. explicit per Caxton, sine anno. 162l. 15s. *Triphook*.

Chauncy's *Historical Antiquities of Hertfordshire*, fine copy, red morocco, with all the plates. 1700. 26l. 5s. *Rodd*.

Chesse. *The Game and Playe of the Chesse*, translated out of the Frenche, and empynted by Caxton. 1474. 42l. *Paync*.

This is one of the rarest productions of Caxton's Press, and reputed to be the first book printed in England. Fine copy, Venetian morocco, but the last leaf is supplied by MS. and the leaf of the table wanting.

Chronica del muy esclarecido Principe y Rey don Alfonso el Onzeno, very rare, blue morocco. Valladolid, 1551. 20l. *Arch*.

SIXTH DAY'S SALE.

Octavo et Infra.

Coverdale (Myles) *The Olde Fayth*, an evydent probation out of the Holy Scripture, that the Christen Fayth (which is the right true olde and unfounded faith) hath endured sens the begynnyng of the worlde, black letter, very fine copy, blue morocco, rare. 1541. 2l. 15s. *Cochrane*.

Cranmer's *Catechismus*, that is to say, a short Instruction into Christian Religion, for the synguler commoditie and profyte of children and yong people, black letter, fine copy, portrait inserted, blue morocco, rare. Gualterus Lynne excudebat. 1548. 4l. 18s. *Hutton*.

Cromwell, *Court and Kitchen of Elizabeth*, commonly called Joan. Cromwell, portrait, blue morocco. 1664. 2l. 18s. *Higgs*.

Quarto.

Christi Vita, *The Lyfe of our Lord Jhesu Chryste* after Bonaventure, black letter, wood cuts, blue morocco, very rare. Wynkyn de Worde, 1517. 8l. *Longman*.

Christ, *La Vie de Notre Seigneur Jésus Christ*, suivie de plusieurs Prières, Manuscrit sur velin du commencement du quinzième Siècle, avec vingt-cinq miniatures très curieuses. 8l. 15s. *Clarke*.

Christofol, *Varios Versos per Honrrar de Sant Christofol*, containing a series of Prize Poems in praise of Saint Christopher in the Valencian Dialect, very rare. Valencia per Peretringer, 1498. 29l. 10s. *Triphook*.

Churchyard's (Thomas) *Works*, collected in two volumes, morocco, of uncommon rarity, from the Roxburghe Collection. 1560. 85l. 1s. *Triphook*.

Ciceronis Opera omnia, Oliveti, 9 vols. Geneva, 1758. 10l. 5s. *Triphook*.

Ciento Novelle Antike, (Le) original edition, very fine copy, green morocco, rare, from the Roxburghe Collection. Bologna, Girol. Benedetti, 1525. 14l. 14s. *Triphook.*

Cockes and Cock-fighting, The Commendation of, wherein is shewed, that Cocke-fighting was before the comming of Christ, by George Wilson, black letter, russia, rare. K. Tomes, 1607. 8l. 8s. *Longman.*

Cooper's Chronicle, black letter, fine copy, red morocco. 1565. 4l. *Booth.*

Copland's Hye Way to the Spyttel Hous, in verse, black letter, morocco, extremely rare. Lond. R. Copland, no date. 15l. 15s. *Perry.*

Cornazani (Antonii), quod de proverbiorum origine inscribitur: opus nunquam alias impressum, &c. fine copy, bound in russia, by Roger Payne, very rare. Mediolani, 1503. 4l. 11s. *Hare.*

Coryat's Cratabe, or his Colwort twice sodden, very fine copy, red morocco. 1611. 5l. 10s. *Hare.*

Coriat (Mr. Thomas) to his Friends in England sendeth greeting from Agra, the Capitall of the Great Mogul, red morocco. 1618. 6l. 6s. *Triphook.*

Cracovia (Matthæi de) tractatus Rationis et Conscientiæ de sumpcione pabuli Corporis N. Jesu Christi, a very early edition, in characters resembling those of the Catholicon of 1460, attributed to Guttemberg, a beautiful copy, uncut, elegantly bound in Venetian morocco, by Roger Payne, very rare. 6l. 6s. *Longman.*

Folio.

Chronycles of Englonde, with the Description of Britain, black letter, red morocco, from the Roxburghe Collection, very rare. Lond. Julian Notary, 1513. 56l. 14s. *Higgs.*

Cicero. The Boke of Tulle of Old Age and Friendship, russia. Emprinted by me, symple persone, William Caxton, 1481. 87l. 3s. *Triphook.*

A remarkably beautiful copy of one of the best specimens of Caxton's Press. From the Merly Library.

Cirongilio. Los quatro libros del Valeroso Cavallero Don Cirangilio de Tracia, por Bernardo de Vargas, very fine copy, red morocco, extremely rare, from Col. Stanley's Library. Sevilla, 1545. 33l. 12s. *Triphook.*

Compost et Kalendrier des Bergiers, wood cuts, black letter, Par. Guy Marchant, 1500. 5l. 5s. *Hibbert.*

Daniell's Oriental Scenery, containing one hundred and thirty-two most exquisitely beautiful coloured views, on a grand scale, faithfully representing the Edifices, Antiquities, Ruins, Mausolea, Hill Forts, Landscapes, &c. of Hindostan, and the Hindoo Excavations at Ellora, in 6 vols. Atlas folio. 1795, &c. 68l. 5s. *Arch.*

This is the finest work ever published upon India. The views are all coloured, so as to resemble the finest Drawings.

This copy wants the twelve first Plates of the Second Series.
Denon, Voyage dans la Basse et la Haute Egypte, 2 vols. plates, splendidly bound in blue morocco, with joints. Par. 1802. 14l. 14s. Johnston.

D'Oshson (Mouradjia) Tableau général de l'Empire Othoman, 2 vols. plates, elegantly bound in russia, Par. 1787-90. 15l. Arnould.

SEVENTH DAY'S SALE.

Octavo et Infra.

Dialogue or Familiar talke betwene two neighbours concerning the chiefeest ceremonies that were by the mighti power of God's most holie pure Worde, suppressed in Englande, and now for our unworthines, set up agayne by the Bishoppes, the impes of Antichrist, blue morocco, rare. From Roane, by Michael Wodde, 1554. 1l. 11s. 6d. Rodd.

Donne's Poems, with portrait by Marshall inserted, uncut, red morocco, with joints. Tonson, 1719. 4l. 10s. Rodd.

Drummond of Hawthornden's Poems. This copy has both the title pages, with portrait by Gaywood, bound in russia by Roger Payne, rare. 1656. 3l. 5s. Jervis.

Eicon Basalice, The Pourtraicture of his Sacred Majesty in his Solitudes, frontispiece by Marshall, blue morocco, with the royal cipher on the sides. 1649. 1l. 3s. Seymour.

Elder, John. Copie of a Letter sent into Scotlande, of the Arrivall, and Landynge, and Marryage of the Prince of Spain to Quene Mary, black letter, rare. J. Wayland, (1555.) 6l. 16s. 6d. Triphook.

Emblèmes Divers, Recueil de, 100 Emblems painted upon vellum with great spirit and delicacy of execution, bound in red morocco. 5l. 15s. Payne.

Emblemata Amores Moresque spectantia, Hollandicè, Gallicè, et Anglicè, 52 plates. sine nota. 2l. 19s. Clarke.

Quarto.

Cromwell. Irenodia Gratulatoria Oliveri Cromwelli, dedicatum Domino Præsidi Bradshawo, cæterisque Concilii-Statu-Consultis, &c. a Payne Fisher. Two Portraits of Cromwell, one on horseback, by Faithorne, the other, a Page putting on his sash, by Trevillian. With an Account of the Family of Cromwell in MS. by Richard Verney, blue morocco, rare. Londini, 1652. 3l. Lepard.

Damascenus. Liber Gestarum Barlaam et Josaphat servorum Dei, greco sermone editus a Johanne Damasceno, editio antiqua, red morocco. sine ulla nota. 5l. 15s. 6d. Triphook.

- Daryus. A pretie new Enterlude, both Pithie and Pleasaunt, of the Storje of King Daryus, black letter, red morocco, very rare. London, by T. Colwell, 1565. 18l. 7s. 6d. *Jervis.*
- De Bry (Theodori) Emblemata Nobilitati et vulgo scitu Dignis Singulis Historiis Symbola adscripta et elegantes versus Historiam explicant, 2 vols. fine impressions, red morocco. Francof. 1593. 19l. 8s. 6d. *Payne.*
- Decor Puellarum. Questa sie una opera la quale si chiama Decor Puellarum: Zoe honore delle Donzelle. Jenson, 1461 (sic). Luctus Christianorum. Questa e una opera la quale se chiama, Luctus Christianorum ex passione Christi, &c. Jenson, 1471. Palma Virtutum zioe Triumpho de Virtude, Jenson, 1471. Gloria Mulierum. Qui comenza el proemio del ben viver de le done Maridade, Jenson, (circa 1471). Parole Devote de l'Anima innamorata in Misser Jesu, Jenson, 1471. Five Tracts of the greatest rarity. In very fine condition, bound in one volume in russia. 39l. 18s. *Appleyard.*
- Dialoges of Creatures Moralyse, of late translated out of Latyn into our Englishhe tonge, wood cuts, black letter, red morocco, rare. 15l. *Triphook.*
- They be to sell upon Powly's Church Yard, no date.
- Dolce, Il Palmerino, fine copy, red morocco. Venet. Sesso, 1561. 3l. 15s. *Triphook.*

Folio.

- Doomsday Book, 2 vols. russia. 5l. 10s. *Newland.*
- Durerus (Albertus) De Geometria et Symmetria, cuts, Thuanus's Copy, in yellow morocco. Par. 1535. 3l. 19s. *Payne.*
- Dyalogus Creaturarum optime Moralizatus Jocundis Fabulis plenus, wood cuts, first edition, very fine copy, red morocco. Gouda per Gerardum Leeu, 1480. 10l. *Clarke.*
- Emblesmes et Devises Chrestiennes et Morales, consisting of thirty Drawings in pen and ink, with MS. explanations in French, blue morocco. 5l. 2s. 6d. *Payne.*
- Esplandian, Las Sergas de Esplandian Hijo Legitimo de Amadis de Gaula, yellow morocco, very rare. Alcala, 1588. 11l. 11s. *Hibbert.*
- "Esplandian was written by Ordonez de Montalvo, the original editor of the four first books of Amadis, of Gaul, in Spanish, and intended to form the fifth book of that celebrated romance. Esplandian was in Don Quixote's Library."—Stanley Cat.
- Evangelia Quatuor, Latinè. A manuscript upon vellum, which appears by the initial letters, &c. to have been written about the 10th century. The figures intended to represent the four Evangelists are drawn in the most grotesque and ludicrous style

imaginable, and are evidently of very great antiquity. From the Monastery of Conio, bound in purple velvet. 7l. 7s. *Booth*.
 Everdingen's Original Spirited Drawings for the History of Reynard the Fox, with a Proof Set of the Etchings, carefully mounted on drawing paper, and bound in 2 vols. in russia. 85l. 1s. *Hibbert*.

EIGHTH DAY'S SALE.

Octavo et Infra.

Luripidis Tragœdiæ Septemdecim, first edition, red morocco. Venet. Aldi, 1503. 4l. 11s. 6d. *Lepard*.
 Fabliaux et Contes, &c. Nouvelle Edition, par Meon, 4 vols. grand papier de Hollande, proof plates, russia, gilt leaves. Par. 1808. 5l. 5s. *Warder*.

Quarto.

Dysputacyon, or Complaint of the Herte thorughe perced with the lokinge of the eye, fine copy, morocco, very rare. Inprynted at London by Wynkyn de Worde, without date. 34l. 13s. *Hudson*.
 Edward. The Lyfe of Saynt Edward Confessour and Kynge of Englande, black letter, splendidly bound in red morocco, with joints, extremely rare. Wynkyn de Worde, 1533. 13s. 13s. *Triphook*.
 Edward VI. Certayne Sermons or Homilies appointed by the Kinge's Majestie to be declared and redde every Souday, black letter, red morocco, scarce. Lond. Whitechurche, 1547. 2l. 7s. *Cochrane*.
 Edyth. XII. Merry Jestes of the Wyddow Edyth, in Verse, black letter, very rare. Rich. Johnes, 1573. 22l. 1s. *Triphook*.
 Egeria. The Adventures of Lady Egeria, her miserable Banishment by Duke Lampanus her Husbände, &c. by W. C. scarce. Lond. R. Waldegrave, — 10l. 5s. *Heber*.
 Emblematum Philomelæ Thiloniæ Epidigma, Verses and Emblems on the Family of Thilo, with an engraved title, and very fine impressions of the plates, green morocco, with joints. Typis Ligiis Sartorianis, 1603. 7l. 7s. *Payne*.
 Emblemata Selectiora, Typis Elegantissimis expressa, blue morocco, with joints. Amst. 1704. 1l. 19s. *Payne*.
 Englysshe and Frensshe. Here begynneth a lytell Treatyse for to lerne Englysshe and Frensshe, black letter, very rare and curious. Wynkyn de Worde, no date. 9l. 15s. *Rodd*.
 Epistles and Gospells, with a brief Postil upon the same from after Easter till Advent, black letter, blue morocco, very rare. Richarde Bankes, 1540. 4l. *Cochrane*.
 Erasme les Louenges de Folie, black letter, wood cuts, very fine copy, yellow morocco. Paris, Galliot du Pré, 1520. 5l. 12s. 6d. *Hibbert*.

Espee, Icy commenche ung tres beau Livre, contenant la Chevalereuse Science des Joueurs d'Espee, black letter, numerous very curious woodcuts, blue morocco, excessively rare. Anvers, par Guillaume Vorsterman, 1538. 5l. 5s. *Payne*.

Exhornatorium Curatorum for the Cure of Soules, black letter, consisting of 16 leaves, not mentioned in the last edition of Ames, red morocco, very rare. Julian Notary, 1519. 8l. *Longman*.

Evelyn's Silva; or, Discourse on Forest Trees, with Notes by Hunter, 2 vols. in 1, plates, russia. York, 1776. 7l. *Sir C. Blunt*.

Folio.

Fayttes of Armes. Here begynneth the Book of Fayttes of Armes, and of Chyvalrie, splendidly bound in Venetian morocco, with morocco lining. per Caxton, (1489). 44l. 2s. *Longman*.

A very fine specimen from Caxton's press.

Ferrarii Hesperides, sive de Malorum Aureorum cultura et usu, yellow morocco, ruled. Romæ, 1646. 2l. 6s. *Triphook*.

Fier a Bras. Le Roman de Fier a Bras, le Geant, first edition, fine copy, morocco, from the Roxburghe Collection, extremely rare. Geneve, 1478. 29l. 18s. 6d. *Triphook*.

Florando. La Coronica del Valiente y Efforçado Principe Don Florando d'Inglaterra hijo del Principe Paladiano, wood cuts, blue morocco, very fine copy, extremely rare. Lisbona, 1545. 26l. 15s. 6d. *Triphook*.

Fontaine, les Fables de la, avec figures par Oudry, 4 vols. large paper, red morocco, borders of gold. Par. 1755-59. 13l. 2s. 6d. *Knell*.

Froissart's Cronycles of Englaunde, Fraunce, &c. translated by John Bouchier Lord Berners, 2 vols. in 1, very fine copy, in blue morocco, by Roger Payne. Lond. Myddelton and Pynson, 1525. 34l. 2s. 6d. *Clarke*.

NINTH DAY'S SALE.

Octavo et Infra.

Gallæi Icones Illustrium Feminarum Veteris et Novi Testamenti et Prophetarum Veteris Testamenti, blue morocco. 1594. 3l. 3s. *Clarke*.

Quarto.

Fenton's Certaine Tragical Discourses, black letter, green morocco. T. Marsh, 1579. 3l. 12s. *Wardcr*.

Figures Emblematiques, Manuscript upon vellum, containing 81 very spirited Emblematical Drawings, with the Moral of each in French Verse, morocco. 10l. 5s. *Triphook*.

Floudon Felde. † Hereafter ensue the trewe encountre, or Batayle lately don betwene Englande and Scotland. In which Batayle the Scottishe Kyng was slayne, black letter, consisting of four leaves, a tract of extraordinary rarity, green morocco, &c. Emprynted by me, Richarde Faques, no date. 13l. 13s. *Triphook.*

Frederyke of Jennen. This mater treateth of a merchatntes Wyfe that afterwarde went like a man, and becam a great Lorde, and was called Frederyke of Jennen afterwarde, black letter, with singular wood cuts, a Book of the greatest rarity, from the Roxburghe Library. Imprynted in Anwarpe, by me, John Dusborrowghe, 1518. 44l. 12s. 6d. *Knell.*

Freheri Paradoxa, Emblemata, Ænigmata, Hieroglyphica; A Manuscript, evidently prepared for Publication. The Mathematical Figures are drawn with very great accuracy, and are accompanied with Explanations in Latin and English. There is also a Portrait of Freherus, by Leuchter, yellow morocco, with joints. 7l. 2s. 6d. *Payne.*

Fyssher's (Bishop of Rochester) Treatyse concernynge the Fruytfull Sayenges of David, in seven Sermons, made at the exortacyon of Margarete, mother to Kyng Henry the Seventh, black letter, fine copy, blue morocco, very rare. Wynkyn de Worde, 1525. 5l. 7s. 6d. *Triphook.*

Fyssher's Sermon on the moost famouse Prynce Kyng Henry the VII. black letter, very rare, blue morocco. Wynkyn de Worde, 1509. 8l. 10s. 6d. *Triphook.*

Fyssher's Mornyng Remembraunce for Margarete, Mother unto Kyng Henry the VII. black letter, blue morocco, very rare. Wynkyn de Worde, 1509. 8l. 10s. 6d. *Triphook.*

Galien Rethore Noble et puissant Chevalier filz du Conte Olivier de Vienne Per de France, wood cuts, black letter, red morocco, rare. Paris, Denis Janot, saus date. 3l. 18s. *Triphook.*

Gardiner's England's Grievance Discovered, in relation to the Coal Trade, with portraits of the Kings and Queens of England, and other plates, russia, scarce. Lond. 1665. 5l. 10s. *Longman.*

Garrarde's Arte of Warre. Becing the onely rare Booke of Myllitarie Profession, corrected and finished by Captain Hichecock, plates, black letter, with joints. R. Warde, 1591. 3l. 5s. *Booth.*

Gascoigne (George). Flowers. Dan Bartholomew of Bath. The Reporter. Comedie, called Supposes. Jocasta. Herbes. The Fruites of Warre. The Fable of Ferdinando Jeronimi. The Steele Glasse; and Phylomenc, black letter, russia, wants title and some leaves of text. 9l. *Booth.*

Geoffroy. Sensuyt les faitz et gestes des nobles coquestes de Geoffroy a la Grant Dent seigneur de Lusignen et siziesme filx de Raymondin Conte du dict lieu et de Melusine, black letter,

green morocco, the last leaf supplied by MS.^a a very rare romance. sans date. 7l. *Triphook*.

Gerard. L'Histoire de très noble et chevaleureux Prince Gerard Conte de Nevers et de Rethel, et de la très vertueuse et très chaste Princesse Euriant de Savoye sa mye, black letter, wood cuts, rare. Paris, pour Philippe le Noir, 1526. 5l. *Triphook*.

Gerardo di Vera Tre Navigationi fatti dagli Olandesi e Zelandesi al Settentrione, Venet. 1599. Diarium Gulielmi C. Schoutenii, Amst. 1662. 2 vols. in 1, plates, russia. 6l. 16s. 6d. *Hibbert*.

Gerson. A Treatyse of the Imytacion and Folowyng the blessed Lyfe of oure moste Mercyfull Sayvoure Criste, compyled in Latin by John Gerson, and translate into Englysshe, the yere of oure Lorde, 1502, by Maister Willyam Atkynson, Doctor of Divinite, R. Pynson, 1503. The fourthe Boke of the folowinge Jesu Chrjst, and of the contempninge the World, R. Pynson, 1504, in 1 volume, rare. 11l. 15s. *Heber*.

Gesta Romanorum cum quibusdam aliis historiis eisdem annexis de vitiis virtutibusque cum applicationibus moralisatis et mysticis, fine copy, russia, very rare. Impressit Johannes de Westphalia alma in Universitate Lovaniensi. sine anno. 4l. 5s. *Triphook*.

Giglan. L'Hystoire de Giglan filz de Messire Gauvain qui fut Roy de Galles. Et de Geoffroy de Maiënce son Compaignon, black letter, wood cuts, yellow morocco, rare. Lyon, Huguetan, 1539. 6l. 10s. *Lang*.

Godeffroy. Les Faitz et Gestes du preux Godeffroy de Boulion, et de ses freres Baudouin et Eustache, black letter, wood cuts, fine copy, from the Roxburghe Collection, very rare. Paris, par Jehan Bouffon, sans date. 18l. 18s. *Longman*.

Folio.

Glanvilla, Bartholomeus, de Proprietatibus Rerum, translated into English, fine copy, Wynken de Worde, no date. 53l. 11s. *Triphook*.

This Book is printed on the first paper manufactured in England.

Good Lyvyng and good Deyng, the Traytte of, et the paynys of Hel et the paynys of Purgatoyr, &c. wood cuts, very rare, imperfect at the beginning. Paris, A. Verard, without date. 8l. 5s. *Longman*.

TENTH DAY'S SALE.

Octavo et Infra.

Goulburn's Blueviad, a Satyrical Poem. 1805. 3l. 10s. *Ponton*.

Henry VIII. The Practyse of Prelates, whether the Kinges grace may be separated from hys Quene, because she was his brothers wyfe, Marboreh, 1530. A Treatise of the Cohabitacyon of the

faithfull with^d the unfaithfull, 1555. A Declaration of the then Commandementes, wants title. Three Tracts by Tyndale, black letter, very rare. 4l. 4s. *Heber.*

Henry VIII. Letters in answe're to a certayne Letter of Martyn Luther sent unto hym by the same, and also the copy of the foresayd Luther's Letter, in suche order as hereafter foloweth, black letter, fine copy, blue morocco, extremely rare. See Dibdin's Ames, Vol. II. p. 288. London, R. Pynson, no date. 4l. 14s. 6d. *Triphook.*

Herodotus Gr. et Lat.^{ex} Edit. Wesselingii et Reitzii, 7 vols. large paper, yellow morocco. Edinburgi, 1806. 3l. 13s. *Triphook.*

Quarto.

Greepe's (Thomas) the True and Perfect Newes of the Exploites performed and doone by that valiant Knight, Syr Francis Drake, not onely at Sancto Domingo and Carthiagena, but also nowe at Cales, and upon the Coast of Spayne, 1587, in verse, black letter, russia, rare. J. Charlewood, 1589. 10l. *Strettell.*

Gringore, les Fantasies de Mere Sote, avec Privilege, daté de Paris, 1516, black letter, wood cuts, fine copy, blue morocco, first edition, rare. 9l. 9s. *Lang.*

Heinsii Poemata, Gr. et Belg. plates, fine impressions, blue morocco, with joints. Amst. 1616. 2l. 16s. *Clarke.*

Hentzner's Journey into England, morocco, with joints. Reading, 1807. 3l. 12s. *Triphook.*

Herbarum, Tractatus de Virtutibus, cuts. Venet. 1508. 3l. 4s. *Clarke.*

Heywood's (John) Parable of the Spider and the Flie, portrait, wood cuts, black letter, fine copy, red morocco. Lond. T. Powell, 1556. 10l. 5s. *Triphook.*

Heywoode's Workes, a Dialogue conteyning the number of the Effectual Proverbes, concerning two maner of Mariages. With six hundred Epigrammes, portraits, black letter, fine copy, blue morocco, rare. T. Marsh, 1576. 8l. 8s. *Strettell.*

Hoare, the Itinerary of Abp. Baldwin through Wales, by Giraldus de Barri, translated by Sir R. C. Hoare, 2 vols. large paper, plates, red morocco, with joints. 1806. 10l. 15s. *Milner.*

Holinshead's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland, 6 vols. russia. 1807, &c. 8l. 10s. 6d. *Clarke.*

Hollar's Habits of English and Foreign Ladies, 1640, with 28 Plates added, chiefly Views, mounted on drawing paper. 4l. 6s. 6d. *Arch.*

Holy Bull (The) and Crusado of Rome, first published by Gregory XIII. and afterwards renewed and ratified by Sixtus V. black letter, green morocco. John Wolfe, 1588. 2l. 18s. *Longman.*

Homelye (An) to be read in the tyme of Pestilence, and a most

presente remedye for the same, by Bishop Hooper, black letter, blue morocco, rare. Worcester, by J. Oswen, 1553. 3*l.* 6*s.* *Heber.*

Homeri Ilias et Odyssea, Gr. et Lat. cum Scholiis Didymi cura Schrevelii, large paper, red morocco, very rare, with Schiavonetti's two plates inserted. Lugd. Bat. 1656. 13*l.* 13*s.* *Drury.*

Folio.

Gower Confessio Amantis. Emprynted by me, William Caxton, 1483. 205*l.* 16*s.* *Triphook.*

A remarkably fine and perfect copy of one of the most interesting and desirable books printed by Caxton, bound in russia. Gower's Confessio Amantis, russia. Berthelet, 1554. 4*l.* 14*s.* 6*d.* *Triphook.*

Gregorii (Sancti Papæ) Expositio in Librum Extremum Ezechielis Prophetæ. A very ancient Manuscript, upon Vellum, which appears, by the formation of the Capital Letters, to have been written in the 13th Century, red velvet. 6*l.* 16*s.* 6*d.* *Drury.*

Guerino prenominato Meschino, second edition, the Table is wanting, and the first leaf is very accurately supplied by MS. red morocco, from the Roxburghe Library. Venezia Gerard. de Flandria, 1477. 13*l.* 13*s.* *Triphook.*

Guerino chianato Meschino, fine copy, red morocco. Venetia per Jo. Aluiscio Milanese de Varesi, 1498. 10*l.* *Triphook.*

Guy de Warwick Chevalier d'Angleterre qui en son temps fit plusieurs conquestes en Angleterre, en Allemagne, &c. wood cuts, red morocco, very rare, from the Roxburghe Library. Par. Franç. Regnault, 1525. 27*l.* 6*s.* *Triphook.*

Gyron le Courtoys avec la Devise des Armes de tous les Chevaliers de la Table Ronde, wood cuts, extremely rare, a very fine copy, in red morocco, from the Roxburghe Library. Par. Verard, sans date. 34*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* *Hibbert.*

Hamilton's (Sir W.) Campi Phlegraei, coloured from Drawings after Nature, original edition. Naples, 1776. 11*l.* 11*s.* *Longman.*

Harris's Thirty beautifully coloured Drawings upon vellum, of English Insects, with the Plants upon which they feed. The original Drawings for his Natural History of English Insects. 8*l.* 10*s.* 6*d.* *Triphook.*

Herball, (The Grete) which geveth parfyt knowlege and understanding of all maner of Herbes, wood cuts, black letter, russia, rare. Peter Treveris, 1525. 5*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* *Triphook.*

DISSERTATION

Historique, Littéraire et Bibliographique, sur la Vie et les Ouvrages de MACROBE,

NO. II.—*Vid. No. XXXIX. p. 113.*

SATURNALES.

NOUS voici parvenus au plus important des ouvrages de Macrobe, à celui qui lui assure une réputation durable parmi les savans. Il n'entre point dans mon plan de décrire les fêtes dont cet ouvrage porte le nom ; d'ailleurs il suffiroit pour cela, de transcrire les chap. 7 et 10 du livre 1^{er}, qu'on pourra tout aussi bien lire dans l'auteur lui-même. Qu'il me suffise de dire que Macrobe a divisé son ouvrage en sept livres, dans lesquels il raconte à son fils des conversations qu'il suppose tenues dans des réunions et dans des festins, qui auroient eu lieu pendant les Saturnales, chez Prætextatus. Avant d'analyser l'ouvrage, je dirai quelque chose des personnages que Macrobe y fait parler.

C'est d'abord un jurisconsulte nommé Postumien, qui raconte à son ami Décius¹ les discussions qui ont eu lieu chez Prætextatus, pendant les Saturnales, telles que les lui a racontées Eusèbe, l'un des interlocuteurs, lequel avoit eu soin, au sortir de ces réunions, de mettre par écrit ce qu'il venoit d'y entendre. Postumien y avoit assisté le premier jour ; mais ensuite obligé de vaquer à ses occupations ordinaires, il s'y étoit fait remplacer par Eusèbe ; en sorte que les véritables interlocuteurs des *Saturnales* ne sont qu'au nombre de douze, savoir : outre Eusèbe, Prætextatus, Flavien, Symmaque, Cæcina Decius Albinus, Furius Albinus, Eustathe, Nicomaque Avienus, Evangelus, Disaire Horus et Servius. Il est à remarquer que Macrobe ne parle jamais de lui-même à l'occasion de ces réunions, et ne dit nulle part qu'il y ait assisté ; il est même difficile de ne pas croire, d'après les expressions de son prologue, que ce ne sont que de pures fictions, ou du moins qu'il a beaucoup ajouté à la réalité. “ Je vais exposer,” dit-il, “ le plan que j'ai donné à cet ouvrage.—Pendant les Saturnales, les plus distingués d'entre les nobles de Rome se réu-

¹ D'après un passage du ch. 2, liv. 1, il paroîtroit que ce Décius est le fils d'Albinus Carcina, l'un des interlocuteurs des *Saturnales*; Pontanus en a fait la remarque.

nissent chez Prætextatus, etc.” N’est-ce pas là un auteur qui expose le plan de sa fable ? mais poursuivons : après avoir comparé ses banquets à ceux de Platon, et le langage de ses interlocuteurs à celui que le philosophe grec prête à Socrate, Macrobe continue ainsi : “ Or si les Cotta, les Lélius, les Scipion ont pu disserter dans les ouvrages des anciens sur les sujets les plus importants de la littérature Romaine, ne sera-t-il pas permis aux Flaviens, aux Albins, aux Symmaques, qui sont leurs égaux en gloire, et ne leur sont pas inférieurs en vertu, de disserter sur quelque sujet du même genre ? et qu’on ne me reproche point que la vieillesse de quelquesuns de mes personnages est postérieure au siècle de Prætextatus, car les Dialogues de Platon sont une autorité en faveur de cette licence—— : c’est pourquoi, à son exemple, l’âge des personnes qu’on a réunies n’a été compté pour rien, etc.”¹ Après ces derniers traits, il reste démontré pour moi, que si des réunions et des discussions philosophiques et littéraires se sont réellement tenues chez Prætextatus, Macrobe ne nous en a transmis qu’un résultat arrangé à sa manière. Quoi qu’il en soit, comme les personnages qu’il met en scène ont effectivement existé et à peu près vers la même époque, je vais successivement dire un mot sur chacun d’eux.

Prætextatus doit occuper le premier rang, car c’étoit lui qui présidoit la réunion en qualité de *rex mensæ* : outre que les séances se tenoient dans sa bibliothèque,² il paroît que c’étoit un homme profondément versé dans les rites sacrés et les mystères du polythéisme. Néanmoins, et malgré l’attachement qu’il professoit pour le paganisme, il disoit, s’il faut en croire saint Jérôme,³ “ qu’on me fasse évêque de Rome, et sur-le-champ je me fais chrétien.” C’est lui qui, dans l’ouvrage de Macrobe, porte la parole le plus souvent et le plus longuement. S’il fut un des hommes les plus distingués de son temps par ses connoissances, il ne le fut pas moins par les emplois importants qu’il remplit. En effet on le trouve désigné comme préfet de Rome en l’an 384, sous Valentinien et Valens.⁴ Godefroi rapporte,⁵ sur la foi d’un manuscrit, qu’il fut préfet du prétoire en 384. Ammien-Marcellin⁶ lui prodigue les plus grands éloges,

¹ *Saturnal.*, liv. 1, ch. 1.

² *Saturnal.*, liv. 1, ch. 6.

³ *Epist. ad Pammach.*, 61.

⁴ *Codex Theodosianus*, l. 2, *ut dignitat. ord. servetur*.

⁵ *Codex Theodosianus, cum Commentario perpetuo*, Jac. GOTHOFREDI, edit. a J. Dan. Rittero, Lipsiæ, 1736, 6 vol. in-fol., sur la loi 5, de *mod. mult.*

⁶ Liv. 27, anno 368.

en énumérant tout ce qu'il fit à Rome pendant sa préfecture. Il nous apprend aussi¹ qu'il fut proconsul d'Achaïe, sous Julien, et il occupoit encore cette place pendant les premières années de Valentinien, comme on peut le voir dans Zosime,² qui au reste ne lui prodigue pas moins d'éloges qu'Ammien-Marcellin. Symmaque lui a adressé plusieurs de ses lettres;³ dans d'autres, il eut à déplorer sa mort, et dans la lettre 25 du liv. 10 il nous apprend que, lorsqu'elle le surprit, il étoit désigné consul pour l'année suivante. C'est ce que confirme aussi une inscription rapportée par Gruter, et que je vais transcrire. Elle provient d'une table de marbre trouvée à Rome, dans les jardins de la villa Mattei.⁴

Cette inscription étoit placée au-dessous d'une statue élevée en l'honneur de Prætextatus. Sa famille, l'une des plus distinguées de Rome, a donné à cette ville plusieurs personnages illustres, dont on peut voir la notice dans la *Roma subterranea* d'Aringhi. On y verra aussi que cette famille a donné son nom à l'une des catacombes de cette ville. Aringhi lui consacre le ch. 16 de son liv. 3, sous le titre de *Cameterium Prætextati*.⁵

Symmaque est connu par une collection de lettres, divisées en dix liv., qui est parvenue jusqu'à nous. Il y parle plusieurs fois contre les chrétiens; saint Ambroise et Prudence y répondirent. L'heureux et inépuisable conservateur de la bibliothèque Ambrosienne de Milan, M. l'abbé Maj, vient de découvrir et de publier, pour la première fois, des fragmens considérables des discours de Symmaque.⁶ Ce dernier avoit fait aussi une traduction grecque de la Bible, dont il ne nous reste plus que quelques lambeaux. Son père avoit été sénateur sous Valentinien; lui-même il remplit sous cet empereur la charge de correcteur de la Lucanie et du pays des Bruttians en 365 ou

¹ Liv. 22.

² Liv. 4.

³ Liv. 1, *Epist.* 44-55, et liv. 10, *Ep.* 30-32.

⁴ Vettio. Agorio. Prætextato. V. C. Pontifici. Vestæ. Pontifici. Soli. Quindecimviro. Auguri. Tausoliato. Coridi. Neocoro. Hierofante. Patri. Sacrorum. Quastori. Candidato. Prætori. Urbano. Correctori. Tusciæ. Et. Umbriæ. Consulari. Lusitaniæ. Procons. Achaïæ. Præfecto Urbi. Præf. Præt. II. Italiæ. Et. Illyrici. Consuli. Designato.—Dedicata. Kal. Feb.—Dn. Fl. Valentiniano. Aug. III. Et. Eutropio. Coss. '.

⁵ Jan. GRUTERII, *inscriptiones antiquæ curæ*, Joan. Georg. Græci, recensita. Amstelod., 1707, 4 vol. in-fol. pag. 1002, no. 2. On trouvera encore d'autres inscriptions concernant Prætextatus, dans le même Recueil, p. 209, n. 2, 3, 4, p. 310, n. 1, et p. 446, n. 3.

⁶ *Roma subterranea*, Pauli ARINGHI. Romæ, 1651, 2 vol. in-fol., t. 1, p. 476.

⁷ Q. AUR. SYMMACHI, octo *Orationum ineditarum pyrites, invenit, notisque declaravit* Angelus Maius. Mediolano, 1815, in-8°.

368 ;¹ il fut proconsul d'Afrique en 370 ou 373,² c'est lui-même qui nous l'apprend,³ et il paroît, d'après plusieurs de ses lettres, que l'Afrique étoit sa patrie, et qu'il conservoit pour elle le plus tendre attachement. Il fut préfet de Rome sous Valentinien le jeune, en 384, Richomer et Cléarque coss.⁴ Enfin il fut consul avec Tatien, en 391.⁵ Son fils, qui fut proconsul d'Afrique sous Honorius, lui consacra une inscription trouvée à Rome sur le mont Coelius, et publiée pour la première fois par Pontanus, dans ses Notes sur Macrobe.⁶

Eusebe, auteur de cette inscription, est sans doute le même que nous retrouvons au nombre des interlocuteurs des *Saturnales*. Tout ce que nous savons de lui se réduit à ce que nous en apprend Macrobe; qu'il étoit Grec de naissance, et néanmoins aussi versé dans la littérature latine, que dans celle de sa nation; il exerça avec distinction la profession de rhéteur, et son style étoit abondant et fleuri.

Flavien étoit frère de Symmaque. Gruter rapporte une inscription qui le concerne.⁷ En voici une autre trouvée au même temps que celle de Symmaque, que j'ai rapportée plus haut.⁸ Pontanus demande si notre Flavien ne seroit pas le même dont a parlé Jean de Sarisbury en ces termes: "C'est ce qu'assure *Flavien* dans son ouvrage intitulé, de vestigiis Philosophorum;"⁹ et ailleurs, "cette anecdote (celle de la matrone d'Ephèse) racontée en ces termes par Pétrone, vous l'appellerez comme il vous plaira, fable ou histoire, toutesfois *Flavien* atteste que le fait s'est passé ainsi à Ephèse."¹⁰

Cæcina Albinus fut préfet de Rome sous Honorius en 414.¹¹ Rutilius Claudius Numatianus fait mention de lui dans son *Itinéraire*,¹² ainsi qu'Olympiodore, cité dans la *Bibliothèque* de

¹ Leg. 25, de Cursu publico.

² Leg. 73, de Decurionibus.

³ Epist. 16, liv. 10.

⁴ Liv. 44, de Appellationibus.

⁵ Epist. 1, liv. 1; cp. 62-4, liv. 2; cp. 10-15, liv. 5, etc.

⁶ Eusebii. Q. Aurelio. Symmacho. V. C. Quæst. Præt. Pontifici. Majori. Correctori. Lucania. Et. Brittiorum. Comit. Ordin. Tertii. Procons. Africa. Præt. Urb. Cos. Ordinario. Oratori. Disertissimo. Q. Fab. Memm. Symmachus.—V. C. Patri. Optimo.

⁷ P. 170, no. 5.

⁸ Virio Nicomacho Flaviano V. C. Quæst. Præt. Pontific. Majori. Consulari. Sicilie. Vicario. Africa. Quæstori intra Palatium Præt. Præt. iterum cos. ord. historico disertissimo. Q. Fabius Memmius Symmachus V. C. prosocero optimo.

⁹ Polycratius, sive de nugis Curialium et vestigiis philosophorum Lib. viii. a Joanne Saresburiense. Lugd. Batav. 1639. in 8°. Lib. 2. Cap. 26.

¹⁰ Id. Lib. viii. Cap. 11.

¹¹ Leg. un. de Naviculariis.

¹² Liv. 1, v. 466.

Photius. Gruter rapporte deux inscriptions ¹ qui le concernent.²

Nicomachus Avienus étoit encore très-jeune,³ et se bernoit ordinairement à interroger.⁴ Saxius pense⁵ que cet *Avienus* est *Rufus Sextus Avienus*, non point l'auteur des Fables, mais celui qui a traduit les *Phénomènes* d'Aratus et Denys Periegetès. Gruter rapporte,⁶ d'après Smetius et Boissard, une inscription trouvée à Rome, au pied du Capitole, et qui servoit de base à une statue élevée à L. Avr. Avianus Symmachus, V. C., le 3 des kalendes de mai, Gratien IV et Merobaude coss.

Les autres interlocuteurs des *Saturnales* sont : *Eustathe*, philosophe distingué et ami particulier de Flavien ; mais qu'il ne faut pas confondre avec le savant archevêque de Thessalonique, le commentateur d'Homère, puisqu'il n'a vécu que plusieurs siècles après ; *Evangelus*, que Macrobe nous peint sous les traits de la rudesse et de l'âpreté ; *Horus*, Egyptien de naissance,⁷ comme son nom l'indique assez, qui, après avoir remporté plusieurs palmes athlétiques, avoit fini par embrasser la secte des cyniques ; *Disaire*, Grec de nation, qui fut de son temps le premier médecin de Rome ;⁸ et enfin le grammairien *Servius*, le même dont il nous reste un commentaire de Virgile : peut-être conçoit-il l'idée de cet ouvrage au sein des discussions approfondies sur le poëte latin, qui eurent lieu chez Prætextatus ; du moins les paroles que Macrobe place dans sa bouche, à la fin du liv. 3, se retrouvent à peu près textuellement dans le Commentaire du grammairien ainsi que plusieurs de ses observations. A l'époque de nos *Saturnales*, il venoit d'être reçu tout récemment professeur de grammaire, et Macrobe loue également ses connoissances et sa modestie, qui se manifestoit chez lui jusque dans son extérieur.⁹

¹ Pag. 286, n°. 7.

² La première d'après Guttentstein qui l'avoit copiée à Rome sur le marbre ; la voici : *Salutis. D. D. Honorio. Et. Theodosio. P. P. F. F. Semper. Augg. Caecina. Decius. Acinatius. Albinus. V. C. Praef. Urbis. Facto. A. Se. Ad Iccit. Ornavit. Dedicata. Prid. Id. Nonas. Novembr. Is. rust. Il. Lino. Cos.* Voici maintenant la seconde recueillie sur le même marbre par Smetius et par Boissard : — *D. φ. D. φ. Fl. Arcadio. p. Io. Fe Lic. Vitori. ac. Trium Fa. Tori. semper. Augusto. Caecina. Decius. ALbinus. V. C. Præfec. Tus. Urbi. Vice sacra. indicant. devotus. numini. maies. Tu. Tique. eus.* (GRUTER, p. 287, n. 2.) On trouve encore, parmi les interlocuteurs des *Saturnales*, un autre *Albinus* (*Furius*), sur lequel je n'ai pu obtenir aucun renseignement.

³ *Sat.*, l. 6, ch. 7.

⁵ *Onomasticon Litterarium*, t. 1, p. 478.

¹ *Sat.*, liv. 1, ch. 15 et 16.

⁴ *Id.*, liv. 1, ch. 6.

⁶ Pag. 370, n°. 3.

⁸ *Liv.* 1, ch. 7.

⁹ *Liv.* 1, ch. 2.

Maintenant que j'ai fait connoître les personnes que Macrobe fait asseoir à son banquet, je vais tracer une analyse rapide de l'ouvrage lui-même.

Il est divisé en sept livres. Un passage de la fin du sixième, où il est annoncé que Flavien doit dissenter le lendemain sur les profondes connoissances de Virgile dans l'art des augures, annonce qui ne se réalise point, a donné lieu à Pontanus de soupçonner qu'il devoit exister un huitième livre, ce qui eût formé un nombre égal au nombre de jours, que remplissoient en dernier lieu les fêtes des Saturnales. J'ai déjà dit que Barthius a pensé que le Commentaire sur le Songe de Scipion formoit ce huitième livre. Quoi qu'il en soit, H. Étienne a divisé les sept livres qui nous restent en trois *journées*, nombre primitif de la durée des Saturnales ; la première renferme le premier livre. La deuxième renferme les livres 2, 3, 4, 5, et 6, et la troisième renferme le septième et dernier. Cette division, quoique purement arbitraire, et même en opposition avec le texte précis de l'ouvrage, où il n'est fait mention que de deux journées, a toujours été indiquée depuis dans les éditions postérieures. Voici à peu près les matières qui sont renfermées dans les sept livres, et l'ordre dans lequel elles sont disposées.

Le premier livre traite des Saturnales, et de plusieurs autres fêtes des Romains, de Saturne lui-même, de Janus, de la division de l'année chez les Romains, et de son organisation successive, par Romulus, Numa et Jules-César ; de la division du jour civil, et de ses diversités ; des kalendes, des ides, des nones, et généralement de tout ce qui concerne le calendrier romain ; il se termine enfin par plusieurs chapitres très-importans, dans lesquels Macrobe déploie une vaste érudition, à l'appui du système qui fait rapporter tous les dieux au soleil. Cette partie est originale autant que les travaux d'érudition le peuvent être : dans le reste du livre, il a beaucoup pris à Aulu-Gelle et à Sénèque le moraliste.

Le deuxième livre est le plus original, et le plus connu de l'ouvrage de Macrobe. C'est un recueil d'anecdotes, de plaisanteries, de bons mots, même de calembours, en un mot un véritable *ana*. La plupart des choses qu'il renferme ne se trouvent que là, et nous les ignorerions entièrement, si Macrobe avoit négligé de nous les transmettre. La seconde partie du deuxième livre est remplie par des détails très-curieux sur les mœurs domestiques des Romains, leur cuisine, leurs mets, les fruits qu'ils consommoient, et plusieurs autres particularités de ce genre.

Depuis le troisième livre jusqu'au sixième inclusivement, les *Saturnales* deviennent un commentaire approfondi de Virgile, considéré sous divers rapports. Dans le troisième livre, on développe les connoissances du poëte latin, concernant les rites et les croyances de la religion. Dans le quatrième, on fait voir combien toutes les ressources de l'art des rhéteurs lui ont été familières, et avec quelle habileté il a su les employer. Le cinquième n'est qu'un parallèle continuuel d'Homère et de Virgile, où sont signalés en même temps les nombreux larcins que le dernier a faits au poëte grec. Ce qu'il a emprunté aux poëtes de sa nation est dévoilé dans le sixième livre, où sont aussi développés, d'après les ouvrages de Virgile, quelques points curieux d'antiquité.

Le septième livre est imité en grande partie du *Symposiaque* (*repas*) de Plutarque. On y trouve discutées plusieurs questions intéressantes de physique et de physiologie ; et on y remarque ses exemples curieux de la manière dont les sophistes soutenoient le pour et le contre d'une même thèse.

Sans doute la latinité de Macrobe se ressent de la décadence de son siècle ; mais il faut convenir aussi que les défauts de son style ont été beaucoup exagérés par les critiques anciens qui, pendant long-temps, n'ont eu sous les yeux qu'un texte mutilé et totalement défiguré. On lui a surtout reproché ses plagiat avec beaucoup d'amertume. Erasme¹ l'appelle "*Æsopica cornicula*—quæ ex aliorum pannis suos contextuit centones. Non loquitur, et si quando loquitur, Græculum latinè balbutire credas." Vossius le qualifie de *bonorum scriptorum lavernam*. Muret² dit assez plaisamment : "*Macrobius—factitasse eamdem artem, quam plerique hoc seculo faciunt, qui ita humani à se nihil alienum putant, ut alienis æquè utantur ac suis.*" Ange Politien et Scaliger le père ne lui sont pas moins défavorables. Un reproche cependant qu'ils ne lui ont pas adressé, quoiqu'ils eussent pu le faire avec beaucoup de justice, c'est le défaut absolu de méthode et le désordre complet qui règne dans son ouvrage. Encore auroit-il pu s'en excuser par la licence que lui donnoit à cet égard le genre de la conversation, qu'il a adopté. Au reste, la manière modeste dont il s'exprime dans sa préface auroit dû lui faire trouver des juges moins sévères. En effet, il n'a pas prétendu faire un ouvrage ; seulement il réunit dans un seul cadre, pour l'instruction de son fils, le résul-

¹ *Desiderii ERASMI Opera. Lugd. Bat. 1702, 11 vol. in-fol. Dialogus Ciceronianus, sive de optimo genere dicendi, t. 1, p. 1007.*

² *In SENEC. de beneficiis, liv. 3.*

tat de ses nombreuses lectures. Il le prévient qu'il n'a point eu dessein de faire parade de son éloquence, mais uniquement de rassembler en sa faveur une certaine masse de connoissances ; enfin, il a eu grand soin d'avertir le lecteur, que plus d'une fois il avoit copié jusqu'aux propres expressions des auteurs cités par lui. Tous les critiques ne sont pas restés insensibles à cette modestie : Thomasius¹ se croit bien obligé de lui assigner un rang parmi les plagiaires, mais il convient que ce rang est l'un des plus distingués ; le P. Vavasseur² remarque que, s'il emprunte souvent, souvent aussi il produit de son propre fonds ; Cælius Rhodiginus³ l'appelle *autorem excellentissimum, et virum recondita scientiâ*.

Mais ce sont surtout les critiques modernes qui ont rendu à Macrobe une justice pleine et entière. L'éditeur de Padoue (Jer. Volpi) dit avec beaucoup de justesse dans sa préface : "Nemo ferè illorum qui studia humanitatis cum disciplinis gravioribus conjungere amant, cui Macrobiani scripta et grata et explorata non sint." Chompré, qui dans son Recueil d'auteurs latins à l'usage de la jeunesse, a inséré des fragmens du ch. 11 du liv. 1^{er}, et des ch. 2-5 du liv. 2 des *Saturnales*, avec la traduction de ces morceaux, s'exprime ainsi :⁴ " S'il y a un livre à faire connoître aux jeunes gens, c'est celui-là. Il est rempli de choses extrêmement utiles et agréables ; le peu que nous en avons tiré n'est que pour avertir les étudiants qu'il y a un Macrobe qui mérite d'être connu et lu." Enfin, M. Coupé qui, dans ses *Soirées littéraires*,⁵ a consacré un article à Macrobe, et traduit à sa manière, c'est-à-dire analysé vaguement quelques morceaux des liv. 1, 2 et 7, après plusieurs autres choses flatteuses pour notre auteur, finit en ces mots : " Voilà tout ce que nous dirons de cet auteur charmant, à qui nous désirons un traducteur." Ce traducteur s'étoit rencontré ; mais son ouvrage n'a point vu le jour. J. B. Coutures, né en 1651, mort en 1728, qui fut professeur d'éloquence au collège de France, et dont l'éloge a été publié par de Boze, est auteur de cette traduction, selon l'abbé Goujet,⁶ dont l'autorité a été suivie par M. Beau-

¹ THOMASIUS *Dissertatio de plagio litterario*, Lipsiæ, 1673, in-4^o, § 503.

² *De Ludicrà dictione*, section 3, § 2.

³ *Lectiones antiquæ*, liv. 14, ch. 5.

⁴ *Selecta latini sermonis exemplaria*, 1771, 6 vol. in-12, t. 3.—Traductions des modèles de latinité, 1746-74, 6 vol. in-12, t. id.

⁵ T. 4.

⁶ *Mémoires historiques et littéraires sur le Collège de France*, Paris, 1758, 3 vol. in-12, t. 2, p. 455.

chot.¹ Au reste, je crois pouvoir assurer, d'après les recherches que j'ai faites dans les bibliographies étrangères, que les *Saturnales* n'ont été jusqu'ici traduites dans aucune langue.² Douzé de Verteuil, traducteur d'Aulu-Gelle, avoit eu le projet de traduire aussi Macrobe, peut-être l'a-t-il exécuté, car dans un avertissement placé en tête de son 3^e vol. il annonce qu'il en avoit pris l'engagement envers le public. On trouve la traduction de quelques fragmens de Macrobe, dans l'ouvrage suivant : *les Apophthèmes des anciens tirés de Plutarque, de Diogène Laërce, d'Élien, d'Athénée, de Stobée, de Macrobe, de la traduction de Nicolas Perrot, Sieur d'Abblancour* (Paris, Louis Billaine 1664. in-12.)

Nous avons en français un ouvrage en 2 volumes in-12 (Paris, Prault, 1736), intitulé : *Les Saturnales françaises*. La seule ressemblance qu'on y trouve avec celles de l'auteur latin, c'est d'être divisées en journées. La scène se passe pendant les vacances du Palais, dans le château d'un président, situé aux environs de Paris. Cette production médiocre, est attribuée, dans l'excellent ouvrage de M. Barbier,³ à l'abbé de la Baume.

TRAITÉ DES DIFFÉRENCES ET DES ASSOCIATIONS DES MOTS GRECS ET LATINS.

Ce traité de grammaire ne nous est point parvenu tel que Macrobe l'avoit composé ; car ce qui nous reste n'est qu'un abrégé fait par un certain *Jean*, qu'on suppose, d'après Pithou, être *Jean Scot*, dit *Erigène*, qui vivoit en 850, sous le règne de Charles-le Chauve, et qui a traduit du grec en latin les ouvrages de Denys l'aréopagite. Cependant il avoit existé auparavant, selon Trithème, un autre *Jean Scot*, qui vécut sous le règne de Charlemagne, environ l'an 800 ; et il exista depuis un *Jean Duns Scot*, qui vivoit en 1308, sous l'empereur Albert. Le premier éditeur de cet opuscule de Macrobe, Opsopæus, pense que *Jean Scot* en a beaucoup retranché, mais qu'il n'y a rien ajouté du sien.⁴

VII. Outre l'auteur des *Saturnales*, il a encore existé deux au-

¹ *Biographie universelle*, t. 10, p. 138. Vraisemblablement Fabricius aura été induit en erreur par la ressemblance de nom, lorsqu'il attribue cette traduction (*Biblioth. lat.*, t. 3, p. 181. édit. d'Ernesti) au baron des Coutures, auteur des traductions de Lucrèce et d'Apulée.

² L'auteur de cette dissertation prépare une traduction française des *Saturnales*, avec des notes très étendues.

³ *Dictionnaire des ouvrages anonymes et pseudonymes*, par A. A. BARBIER. Paris, 1806. 4 vol. in-8° t. 2, p. 321.

⁴ *Vid.* en tête de son édit. l'Épître dédicatoire à Frederic Sylburg.

tres écrivains du nom de *Macrobe* : l'un diacre de l'église de Carthage, zélé partisan de la doctrine et des écrits de saint Cyprien, et dont l'auteur de l'appendice au traité de saint Hildefonse de S. E. ¹ cite un ouvrage en cent chapitres, tirés de l'Écriture-Sainte, en réponse aux objections des hérétiques ; l'autre plus connu, fut d'abord prêtre en Afrique, et ensuite clandestinement évêque des Donatistes de Rome. ² N'étant encore que prêtre, il écrivit un ouvrage adressé *ad confessorum et virginum*, qui est beaucoup loué par Gennade ³ et par Trithème. ⁴ Mabillon, dans la dernière édition de ses *Analecta*, ⁵ a publié un fragment d'une épître adressée par ce second Macrobe au peuple de Carthage, sur le martyre des Donatistes Maximien et Isaac. L'Anglais Guillaume Cave lui a consacré un article dans son *Histoire des écrivains ecclésiastiques*, ⁶ sous l'année 334.

Pour compléter mon travail sur Macrobe, j'ajouterai dans le prochain No. une *notice*, très-exacte et très-détaillée, des éditions des ouvrages de cet auteur, qu'on trouve en tête de celle de *Deux-Ponts*, et que j'ai traduite du latin, en y joignant quelques *notes*, et une addition.

ALPHONSE MAHUL.

Observations on the Critique in the Quarterly Review on the new Edition of Stephens' Greek Thesaurus.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

SIR,

SOME of the readers of the Quarterly Review may have been, as well as myself, alarmed at the sight of forty-six pages in the number published on Friday last, filled with what pretends to be a criticism on the four first Parts of the London edition of Stephens's Thesaurus. The celebrity of that Journal, however, induced me to hope that the asperity, with which a cursory glance showed them to have been penned, would be compensated for

¹ Ch. 2.

² *Vid. OPTAT., Historia donatistica*, liv. 11, ch. 4.

³ *De Scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, ch. 5.

⁴ Ch. 107.

⁵ T. 4, p. 185.

⁶ *Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Historia litteraria. Ozonia, 1742-43, 2 vol. in-fol.*

by some luminous example of the manner in which some one definite Greek word ought to be explained and illustrated in a Treasury of the Greek language; and that one, who spake thus authoritatively, would prove that the loudness of his sounds did not merely proceed from the emptiness of his brain. That hope has proved utterly vain. If you rob the Reviewer of his petulance, his spleen, and his buffoonery, the scanty remnant will be scarcely worth preserving. But I will leave the turnpike-road for a moment, and hunt the critic to his covert.

The first part of the review is taken up with a somewhat meagre, ill-digested, and uninteresting account of the Greek Lexicons and Glossaries, for which the Reviewer is almost entirely indebted to the *Dissertatio Critica* subjoined by Maussacus to his edition of Harpocration, where any person may easily trace the extent of his obligations,—and to the Preface of Ruhnken to the second volume of Alberti's Hesychius. A prolix enumeration of recondite names may astonish the fashionable readers of the Quarterly Review; but scholars are too well acquainted with the implements and aids, with which the erudition and industry of former ages have supplied the shallowness of their successors, to confound the pretension to learning with its possession, or to mistake the pomp and parade of citation for the familiar knowledge of the nature, characters, and works of those illustrious men, whose names figure on the pages of the literary quack, like the hieroglyphical characters on a conjuror's robe.

The Critic next displays the faults of Steph. Thes.¹ in its original state: these no one is disposed to question. But as it was the professed intention of the Editors to republish the work of Stephens, and to make it the basis of their own, not to compose a new one, the charges, such as they are, must rest with Henri Etienne; and he fortunately is far removed above the censures of the Quarterly Reviewer. The ancient grammarians here and elsewhere are spoken of with the contemptuous arrogance, behind which an inability to understand always skulks, in order to conceal its own weakness. Justice has rarely hitherto been done to the labours of these very acute and ingenious men. In respect to every thing which can solely result from comparative criticism, from an examination of the similitudes and differences,

¹ The Reviewer is facetiously pleased to exclaim (p. 33) that this is an "elegant abbreviation." It would be to confer a noble benefit upon mankind were the learned critic to divulge his theory concerning the beauty of abbreviations; nor do we know any employment more appropriately befitting a Porsoniunculus, than the laying down of canons concerning App. and Ms.

the analogies and contrasts, which pervade and prevail through different languages, grammar, like every other branch of Greek science, is greatly and necessarily defective. That singular people knew and acknowledged no nation except itself. But so far as grammar is an *art*, as distinguished from a *science*, there is no other nation in which that art has been carried to any thing like the degree of perfection which it reached at Athens and Alexandria. In the cultivation and purification of their own language, and in the intelligent developement of its beauties, all other nations compared with the Greeks are mere barbarians. The reader needs only to compare the quibbles and blunders, which usurp the place of verbal criticism in all, even the best of our reviews, with the extreme delicacy and refinement of perception constantly evinced by Dionysius, and handed down by him and by the other great critics of antiquity to their scholars, so that traces of it are to be discovered in even the dullest of the Scholiasts. What a shapeless, unorganized, chaotic mass does every modern language, even the Italian and Spanish, present to us when compared with the Greek ! Nor is our superficial *science* any thing more than a very sorry substitute for their exquisitely developed art. The perceptive faculty in this, as in many other respects, appears to have been almost overlaid and crushed by the extreme amplification and extension of the reflective.

To examine the Reviewer's observations upon Greek etymology in detail would be inconsistent with the plan of the present letter. They may in part be applicable to any project for constructing a new lexicon of the Greek language, but a deviation from the original in so important and fundamental a point could never be expected from those who commenced their undertaking as editors and republishers of the great work of Stephens. The Reviewer, indeed, inveighs against the prevalent practice of reprinting old editions of ancient authors. But there is scarcely a schoolmaster throughout the country, who will not acknowledge his obligations to the Clarendon Press, to Messrs. Cooke, Bliss, Priestley, Valpy, &c., for having enabled them to place in the hands of their pupils readable editions of all the standard classical authors, editions which, however faulty, *are the best*. Every person acquainted with the condition of either of our universities during the last twenty years will have observed that an acquaintance with the chief Greek and Roman writers has become, and is daily becoming, beyond comparison more frequent than it used to be ; and this extension could never have taken place unassisted by the republications which the Reviewer is pleased to reprehend, as "closing the market against better and more accurate publications." A charge less founded has never been

brought forward. Pitiful indeed must be the Reviewer's idea of learning, when he imagines that the increase of the supply will clog the demand :

“ Other pleasures

Cloy th' appetites they feed ; but it makes hungry
When most it satisfies.”

Where are the still-born editions of the ancient classics, the appearance of which has been prevented by the republication of former editions ? What English scholar has wasted his midnight lamp over Homer, or Herodotus, or Thucydides, or Plato, or Demosthenes, and at the moment when his task was over, and the infant has been about to see the face of day, has it been overlaid and stifled by the masses of books which already weighed down the counters and shelves of our booksellers ? It is rumoured at least that about a dozen editions of single plays, with a very few exceptions, form almost the sum total of what half a century of English scholarship has produced. And are our students to famish because the indolence or paucity of their teachers is unable to supply them with sufficient food ? Is a prohibition to be enacted against every importation of foreign learning ? It might indeed prove beneficial to our own pretenders, if they were enabled to strut without fear of competition or rivalry ; but the youth of our country would fare but ill, if dieted upon nothing except grammatical and metrical canons, enacted by the authoritative nod of a few self-complacent critics.¹

The propriety of receiving every “ primitive, the regular tenses of which are preserved in a language,” into a Lexicon of that language, must still remain a very doubtful question. I should feel extreme reluctance to admit into what was designed to be a dictionary of the Greek language, as it existed in actual reality, not as it may exist in the wormy brain of this or

¹ The only reasonable ground of complaint against this practice applies solely to a certain *piratical* portion, though unfortunately a very considerable portion of it. The custom of *immediately* re-printing every saleable classical work, which appears in Germany, is scarcely consistent with the laws of inter-national honesty and honour, and defrauds the industrious continental scholar of a certain portion of emolument, which formerly resulted from his labours, and which at the best was sufficiently scanty. For the German publishers, especially in the *fine paper* portion of their *tirages*, were accustomed to calculate greatly upon the demand of the English market, and one very important work, Schweighauser's Lexicon Herodoteum, was on the point of being altogether checked by this cause. It is quite clear that a reprint can always be effected at an expense considerably less than that of the original publication, and such reprints in the present state of the world must be *legal*, but it were much to be desired, that literature should be freed from the meannesses that always result from keeping *strictly* to the mere letter of the law. All this nowise applies to works wherein all literary property has ceased.

that theorist, any word which notoriously never belonged to that language at any known period of its existence. No language, the nature of which has hitherto been fully investigated, possesses within itself all the first seeds from which in the course of ages it has grown into that form, wherein it is more or less fixed by the introduction of a written literature; and it is a false aim at simplicity to attempt to reduce all the anomalies which it contains under a single form. The roots of all languages mingle and intertwine more or less with one another; some words bear intimations of a connexion with one, some with another of the sister tongues; and all more or less retain the traces of their original union. Hence especially in those words in a language which are of most general application, such as the auxiliary verbs, the pronouns, &c., the meeting together of various primitives, frequently derived from different languages, is always discoverable; nor is it just to conclude, that because some inflections of a word have been introduced into a language, all its inflections must have once belonged to it. Thus for instance the almost complete similarity between the verbs in μ in the Greek and the Sanscrit proves that such verbs were not in all cases derived from Greek primitives in $\epsilon\omega$, but that many of them are to be classed among the original constituents of the language. This applies particularly to the verb $\epsilon\iota\mu\iota$, which the Reviewer selects as an example of a false primitive, but which is proved by its resemblance to the Sanscrit to be a true one.¹ I must however relinquish this subject, merely recommending the Reviewer to study Hermann's remarks on Greek primitives with more attention, than he yet appears to have bestowed on them, before he ventures to state particularly what themes ought or ought not to be introduced under $\alpha\omega$. And since I have adverted to the name of that illustrious scholar, I will inform the Reviewer that a more candid, high-minded, honourable man does not breathe upon earth,—that he is even more endeared to “his school” by the qualities of his heart, than by those of his head,—and that *that* man must be very much wanting in the independence which constitutes, and the modesty which adorns, such a character, who can disgrace himself, and pollute the pages of the Quarterly Review, by the miserable insinuation in the parenthesis p. 340. “Mr Hermann has intermixed a few trivial objections, extorted from him by a sense of decency,

¹ The Sanscrit, *osmi*, *osi*, *osti*, coincide perfectly with *ἴσμι*, *ἴσσι*, *ἴσσι*, if we take the 1st forms of the two first persons. The *o* is merely the short vowel, which would not be expressed except at the beginning of a word, according to the grammatical system means a short *a*, and is commonly pronounced.

amongst several pages of the most fulsome and unsupported (although, we doubt not, unbought) panegyric."—For what possible purpose can such a negative have been introduced, except to insinuate the possibility, if not the probability, of the contrary case? the very notion of which could scarcely have occurred to a person of unprejudiced and gentlemanly feeling.

But what knows the Reviewer of this "school?" The names of Erfurdt, Poppo, Reisig, Nike, the younger Schneider, Seidler, &c., and the anonymous Reviewer of Mr. Blomfield's *Persæ* in the *Jena Alg. Lit. Zeit.* (a translation of which I should much like to see inserted in the *Classical Journal*.) may, I think, contribute to rescue them from oblivion. If their merits are measured by their performances, and contrasted with those of the "English scholars, whom they *facetiously* enough term Porson's disciples," he would be most facetious indeed, who should decide in favor of the Porsoniunculi. No man has a higher respect for the memory of Richard Porson than myself; and therefore no man more regrets the habits which prevented his bequeathing to posterity more numerous and important memorials of his unrivalled critical acuteness. Yet it is but fair to add that foreigners can only judge of him by his published works, and that an edition of four plays of Euripides however accurate,—that even the total extirpation of that *monstrous usurper* the Anapæst in the third place, or all his other efforts for the restoration of legitimacy in the Iambic verse,—are not achievements, however splendid, which in any degree entitle him to that rank amongst the philologists of Europe, which he holds in this country. His letters to Travis, although they completely crushed the latter, only re-settled a question, which, by his own confession, had been determined before; and his posthumous reputation would not have been diminished, if much of that, which encumbers the hot-pressed wire-wove pages of the *Adversaria*, had been exchanged for those emendations of Hesychius and Aristophanes, the praises of which are proclaimed in the preface. Mere hearsay reputation is only handed down unimpaired (if it be so at all) when no authentic records remain, wherewith it may be compared. Porson, like Pitt, would have been classed among those giants, who abstained through consciousness of superiority from the daily conflicts of men, had he left no writings behind him. As it is, his friends, like Fox's, will mourn, that he has left a lasting standard whereby to estimate his powers.—With *things* Porson appears to have possessed but a very inconsiderable acquaintance; and not a trace appears amidst his writings of that combination of universal, encyclopædial knowledge with language-learning, which is so

abundantly found in the Dissertation on Phalaris, and the countless pages of Scaliger, Salmasius, and Casanbon. If the Reviewer can read the controversy on the Homeric Theogony between Creuzer and Hermann, he will find that classical literature affords some problems, which require for their solution quite as much learning and sagacity, and are not a whit less important, than the erasure of an Anapæst; and he will also learn, that it is possible for differences of opinion to be discussed in a manner befitting gentlemen. When Hermann's long expected, and notwithstanding Mr. Blomfield's very meritorious labours in the same field, much to be desired, edition of Æschylus is published, it will be found in what manner he is a worthy successor of the greatest critics,—

“What figure of them he will bear?
For you must know, they have with special soul
Elected him their absence to supply :
Lent him their powers, drest him with their love,
And given his deputation all the organs
Of their own dignity.”

But to return to the *Thesaurus*. The main objections which the Reviewer, after the employment of nineteen months¹ in attempting to hunt out flaws in the work, has made against it are, 1. that some things are omitted which ought to be inserted; 2. that much is inserted that ought to be omitted, “because it increases the bulk and expensiveness of the work, and needlessly distracts the attention of the student,” and this is by far the most substantial charge; 3. that improper critical discussions have been admitted—In this I agree, and trust that Liebel and Vogel will never more occupy its pages; 4. “that Stephens is not given entire,” which I too “truly think that he deserves,” and which I trust will be done most scrupulously for the future: I expect to have Stephens, all Stephens, but yet *much* besides Stephens. 5. That the Editors are “guilty of inconsistencies in their abbreviations of authors' names,” and quote their works at an immoderate length. The last is an evil which, if the Reviewer had taken the trouble to examine the fifth and sixth Numbers, he would have found already in a great degree

¹ The Reviewer says, p. 335. “Since the former part of this Article was written, the fifth and sixth Numbers of the *Thesaurus* have been put into our hands.” Now the fifth Number was published in August 1818, and I sincerely congratulate the Editor of the *Quarterly Review*, on the possession of such a ready, off-hand contributor. How poor Horace would wonder to find a Reviewer acting upon his precept.

remedied; and if he had awaited the publication of the seventh, of which, in common with other subscribers, I received my copy four days anterior to the publication of the Quarterly Review, he would have seen not only the promise, but in the greater part of it the observation, of a system, in which most of these defects were obviated; defects which the Editors had very candidly acknowledged in their reply to Hermann, who had long since anticipated almost all the Reviewer's objections, and to whom he is indebted even for some of his examples. So that they may retort the Reviewer's censure of these objections that they are "trivial," though not "extorted by a sense of decency," against himself. What portion of the latter is possessed by the Reviewer, it would require a new infinitesimal calculus to discover.

I have neither time nor materials with me for entering into an examination of the objections to particular passages (pp. 342 to 345), but doubt not that it will be readily acknowledged that the Note p. 68. should have been omitted, and that some of the English interpretations might be amended. This is "the head and front of the offending;" and when I consider the vast difficulty, labour, and expense necessarily incurred by the undertaking, I am much more surprised that so much has been done, than that so little has been done wrongly. The mere reprinting of Stephens was, for individuals, a sufficiently arduous task; but it must have imprinted a great stigma on the nineteenth century to have been barely contented with republishing the produce of the philology of the sixteenth. The accessions to our critical knowledge of antiquity during the last two hundred and fifty years have been proportionable to the progress that has been made in any other branch of science, and to present these accessions embodied to succeeding generations was reserved for the Editors. It is a noble attempt, and demands, as it has received, the encouragement not only of English, but of European scholars. That the parts, which have hitherto appeared, should not be perfect was unavoidable, for such works must always be imperfect; yet the plan which has been entered upon in the last Number proves that the principal defects will be amended, which is all that can *reasonably* be expected in an undertaking of such extent. Instead of "closing the market" against a future more compendious lexicon of the Greek language, these *pandects* of philology will only prepare the way for it, and incalculably diminish the difficulties of such a work; indeed it is the only manner in which such a collection of materials could be prepared for use, unless the task had been undertaken by a society of scholars maintained at the

public expense: and alas! this is not the era when nations engage in works so beneficial to mankind! The Benedictines of St. Germain des Prés have hitherto found no successors; though a splendid promise is held out by the Berlin Academy.

At the outset the Editors very naturally sinned on the side of *excess*; the use of the file is at once the most difficult and the latest acquired of literary talents. But though it would *not* be "reasonable to conclude that the farther the work proceeds, the greater will be the accumulation of materials," though on the contrary it is strictly reasonable to conclude, that the mere habit of arranging and digesting them will progressively and incalculably diminish their mass,—yet I cannot help picturing to myself the situation of a responsible Editor of a Greek Thesaurus, overwhelmed by the torrents which come rushing in upon him from every side, and which he is to embank and reduce into an equable tranquil stream. Lexicographers, Glossarists, Scholasts, Grammarians, Critics,—the whole host of Greek authors from Homer to Procopius, are marshalled in array upon his desk. Every word in the most copious of languages is to be traced through every modification of meaning which, in the course of above a thousand years, it progressively acquired; and almost each of these words has been diversely, and often in the very same passage contradictorily, explained and illustrated by a multitude of interpreters. What an excitement to prodigality have we here! The greater part of these he is bound to record; his very modesty inducing him to shrink from assuming unto himself the arbitration between disputants, whose talents and erudition all Europe has agreed in acknowledging. How long must it be before he discovers that in learning, as in finance, *magnum vecigal est parsimonia*!

Even the Reviewer seems disposed to agree with me in thinking it "hardly possible that the Editors should not improve as they proceed." But how charitably does he contrive to pare off this excrescence of candour so unnatural to him! It only flashes in the pan, and is followed by nothing but the smoke, in which it is his habit and delight to be enveloped. "The want of care which is observable in the first Numbers is sufficient to detract very materially from the value and utility of the entire work, *even if the remaining portion of it should be executed with greater skill and accuracy.*" Strange though it be, these words are to be found p. 345. It puzzles me to imagine in what manner they have incurred the sin, from which not even reformation can redeem them. A considerable portion of the article indeed would lead one to conclude, that it is the joint manufacture of the

hack of some publisher, who is jealous of them for "closing the market" against a projected *Thes.* of his own, and of the same publisher's head clerk; so accurately versed is the writer or writers in all the double entries of the day-book and ledger; so repeatedly does he calculate and re-calculate with a kind of gloating delight the 200 and 400 guineas which he fondly fancies are likely to accrue to them, and which at the bottom of the very same page become 240 and 480, and in the next 250 and 500 ("inest sua gratia parvis"); and so utterly unable does he appear to understand that they have ever looked for any success in their undertaking, except "in a pecuniary point of view," p. 331. A fair and honourable profit, as it may justly have been within their aim, so I trust, notwithstanding the Reviewer's efforts to crush them, will be within their reach, though hitherto the expense must have very greatly exceeded the returns; and the liberality with which I know that they have repaid the contributions of some foreign scholars, has been duly appreciated.

The reservation of the marks of quantity for the Index, where the accents, to avoid confusion, may be omitted, meets with my entire approbation; and the addition of a poetic instance to most of the words, a requisite improvement, precludes all necessity for them in the body of the work. This and the other changes, to which I have alluded, and which are promised in the recent advertisement, will render the *Thesaurus*, what it ought to be, "a complete body of philology, a well-furnished storehouse of criticism and valuable information upon every subject connected with Greek literature." It is high time that students should not be compelled to refer perpetually to a thousand different works, which those, who have most need for them, have generally the least ability to procure. This *Thesaurus*, with a copious Greek Grammar, and a Greek and English Lexicon, which might be nearly adequately supplied by a literal translation of the new and enlarged edition of Schneider's Dictionary (though the Reviewer speaks with his usual contemptuousness of that work) ought to constitute the chief *subsidia* of a scholar's library.

Another word, and I have done with the Reviewer. He exclaims in answer to the apology of the Editors, that "they *did* possess unlimited resources in books, not in their own libraries perhaps, but in the public repositories of literature, &c. It is never a valid excuse for any scholar to say, that he did not consult this or that book—the answer is, he ought to have done so." The Reviewer ought indeed to have known that, compared with

France and Germany, England is very deficient in great public libraries; that until the late purchase of Dr. Burney's collection, even that of the Museum was poor in philology; and that the use of *most* of them is clogged with many difficulties. If, indeed, the length of human life would allow of their employing upon each page a period proportionable to that consumed by the critic in the composition of his review; if they had not, on the contrary, at a rate sufficiently slow, brought forth three new Numbers during the same period, it might be possible for them in that case to travel to and fro from London to Aberdeen for the verification of an example, and to fix a year, which it would puzzle even this sturdy arithmetician to calculate, for the termination of their labours. As it is, forty Numbers and eight Volumes (the space allotted long since by Valckenaer to a Greek Thesaurus) will bring them to a close.

The approaching publication of the Classical Journal¹ warns me to conclude; and I will therefore dismiss the Reviewer with recommending to his meditation the warning of the philosophic emperor, *Εἰπέ, ὡς δικαιοτάτον φαίνεται σοι, μόνον εὐμενῶς, καὶ αἰδημόνως, καὶ ἀνυποκρίτως*. The Editors possessed my warmest wishes when they commenced their undertaking; and as one of the subscribers, nowise either *directly* or *indirectly* connected with their "*success*," I frankly declare, that I have yet seen no just cause for withdrawing the confidence I had reposed in their ability, or for doubting the ultimate and prosperous accomplishment of the work. Much obloquy they must resolve to endure; all the impertinence of vexatious criticism will, if we are to judge from this specimen, be aimed at them; if they fail, which I prognosticate they will *not*, they will have the consolation of thinking that they have only failed in an attempt, in which few would have had sufficient boldness and public spirit to venture,—and if they succeed, as I think they *must*, they will have conferred a lasting benefit, a real *κτῆμα ἐς ἀνὰ*, on every student of Greek literature, and will therefore be justly entitled to the praise of their contemporaries, and the gratitude of posterity.

II.

¹ The publication of this No. has been necessarily delayed from the usual period, the 1st of April, to the 1st of May, by the Printer's removal from Tooke's Court to Red Lion Court; which suspended the regularity of his labors

P. S. In page 94. of this article the following should read on after ‘pronounced,’ to render the note complete :....“as a short *e*.”—Frederic Schlegel on the language and wisdom of the Indians, p. 9. This completely establishes that $\epsilon\mu\lambda$ was not derived by the Greeks from $\xi\omega$, and that even if $\xi\omega$ ever had been a Greek verb, $\epsilon\mu\lambda$ would still be the older form; a form not derived by the Greeks themselves from $\xi\omega$ as a primitive, but brought by them out of the East. The same is true of $\delta\delta\omega\mu\iota$, which is the Sanscrit *dodami*, *dodasi*, *dodati*, &c. It is possible indeed that the termination in $\mu\iota$ having been incorporated with the Greek language, several new verbs in $\mu\iota$ may have been in after-times formed from verbs in ω : though this is scarcely probable, it being the universal principle in all languages to throw off all complexities of form, and as far as possible to simplify their construction; whence earlier writers always abound to an infinitely greater degree, in what are called anomalous forms. Till due attention has been paid to the filiation of languages, and till the ridiculous notion has been given up that it is a feasible attempt to reduce any one language to the simple, elementary, organic sounds, which are supposed to have been emitted by man in his state of pristine barbarity, etymology can never be any thing but a mass of crude hypotheses. Its procedure must be inductive, not dogmatical. The ambition to theorize has been the bane of this, as of every other science.

In p. 95. read *Porsonupculi*. *

II.

Brighlon, March 21, 1820.

CORRECTIONS IN THE TEXT OF WAKEFIELD'S LUCRETIVS.

THE restoration of precious archaisms and other valuable readings, which preceding editors had changed because they did not understand, in the text of this greatest of all the Latin poets, renders that now under consideration of extreme importance in spite of the filth and rubbish occasionally foisted into it, in the form of conjectural emendations. It is indeed, with all this filth and rubbish, which is in many instances most offensive and disgusting, the only one which exhibits the genuine character of this genuine old Latin, preserved in manuscripts and early editions; but modified to the usages of succeeding writers by modern polishers, who, like the cleaners of other precious remains of antiquity, have, in rubbing off the rust, rubbed off the original surface, and obliterated all the characteristic touches of the artist; in which alone the peculiar energies of his art were displayed.

The late Mr. Gilbert Wakefield, whom the writer of this article personally knew, was a man of quick and acute apprehension, unwearied industry, enthusiastic perseverance, and most retentive and capacious memory; but hasty, irritable, opinionative, and eccentric almost to insanity; so that not having strength of mind to digest, or judgment to discriminate, and arrange his vast acquisitions of knowledge, they fermented into froth, and overflowed in those shallow puddles which disgrace almost every page of his Annotations; but at the same time often hide valuable treasures of critical information for those who can patiently undergo the drudgery of groping for them in the mud.

Had this mud been confined to these puddles it might have remained unknown and inoffensive to all but such gropers: but when he rakes it up, and scatters it over that brilliant and sparkling ore, which he had perhaps just before purified from the less offensive, because less prominent, alloy of others, the evil becomes general: but as mere removal is all that is wanting, it is to be hoped that the next editors will accomplish it, and do that justice to his labors which he was incapable of doing himself.

These blots and blemishes, though in some instances alike injurious to the metre, sense, and syntax, are so few compared with the valuable emendations brought from purer sources, that scarcely any poet is more indebted to any editor: and as the

whole impression has been long since dispersed, and the Commentator, who embarked his whole property in the undertaking, long since removed from any interest in it, they may be pointed out and removed for general benefit, without any particular injury.

How far the archaic spelling adopted is authentic, cannot be very satisfactorily ascertained; the oldest manuscripts extant being in this respect of no authority, and the written monuments of early times remaining, of sufficient length to afford much information, being very inconstant in their orthography, which appears to have continued very unsettled till the reign of Augustus. Lucretius, however, though contemporary with Cicero and Cæsar, seems to have retained the more ancient language, and therefore probably the more ancient spelling of his predecessors in heroic poetry; so that the longest forms, as adopted generally by the editor, are the most probable; and all that we have to complain of under this head, is, what he admits in his preface, a want of constancy and uniformity. In the beginning of the poem we have *suspicio*¹—afterwards *subspicio*²—*obtendo*,³ *subtento*,⁴ *subteneo*,⁵ &c., and afterwards *obstendo*,⁶ *substento*,⁷ *substineo*,⁸ &c.; which are probably just, it being much more likely that the B should have been dropped to produce the common form, *ostendo*, *sustento*, *sustineo*, &c., than that it should have been changed into an S; and we have uniformly *subspendo* for *suspendo*, where the B would have been more liable to elision or change on account of a similar consonant P so nearly succeeding.

Consistent with this archaic spelling, as well as to avoid ambiguity, we should write *artus*, *arte*, &c.; not as we here find them *artus*, *arte*, &c.; and also write *mihi* contracted into one syllable, not *mi*, where *nihil* in one syllable is constantly written at length; and *nihilum*, *vehemens*, *prohibet*, &c., pronounced as two. *Littera*, *fittus*, and *succus*, seem also more truly Latin than *litera*, *litus*, and *sucus*; the investing one letter with the power of two being a mean employed by scribes to shorten their labor even as early as the time of the Elean Inscription. The adjective signifying *smooth*, was however, probably written *lexis* from the Greek λεγος; not *lavis*, as we here find it, without any apparent root or origin. Does not consistency too require that, where we write *artubus*, we should also write *sensubus*, and continue the same forms through all nouns re-

¹ I. 36.

² V. 1203.

³ I. 65.

⁴ II. 1146.

⁵ II. 607.

⁶ IV. 676.

⁷ V. 97.

⁸ V. 558.

spectively of the same declensions; and not suppose that, because the manuscripts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries exhibit them promiscuously, the polished writers of the most polished Latinity so employed them:

Different authors, indeed, of the same age and country, and even the same author in successive works, may have adopted different modes of spelling; but that a single author in a single work should, intentionally and deliberately, have admitted such variations, where they served neither his rhythm nor his metre, seems quite incredible.

Of particular instances of injudicious alterations, the following appear obvious and prominent.

L. i. 14. *Persaltant* for *persultant*, received from a manuscript of no authority, in this instance only, while the common form is retained every where else; nor does the Latin language any where acknowledge such a word as *persalto*.

L. i. 406. *Injectis* for *intectas*, to the utter subversion both of the sense and Latinity, which are generally very intimately connected. *That dogs discover the secret haunts of wild beasts covered with foliage by their noses*, that is by tracing the scent which they leave in going to them, is well known: but that *they discover them by having their noses thrust into foliage* would be new to hunters, even if the words admitted this sense; but to produce this, or indeed any at all, we must read *frundi* or *in frudem*, for *frunde*; neither of which the metre will admit. It is true ancient poets sometimes took the liberty of employing an ablative form in the place of a dative: but this is a liberty which modern critics must not venture to take for them, at least without being authorised by a case completely parallel: for it is impossible that they can have that just feeling for the delicacies of a dead language, which can enable them to decide in what particular case such liberties may or may not be taken.

L. i. 889. On the authority of one manuscript against two, we have *ac* preferred to *atque* before a vowel; though *ac* in that one is probably only a compendious way of writing *atque*; which seems to have been rejected because justly and properly received into all the modern editions.

L. ii. 214. *Nunc heic*, *nunc illic* (which by the same rule that he writes *heic* he ought to write *illeic*) arbitrarily substituted to *nunc hinc*, *nunc illinc*, though these express the poet's meaning much better; which is not that, *fires or lightnings bursting from the clouds, meet now here, now there*; but that *they meet (concurant) now from this and now from that part of the heavens*. It were well if editors would condescend to

understand before they alter—especially such passages as this, in which there is really no difficulty ; but unfortunately the latter is always most easy and most flattering.

L. 11. 362. Here, on the authority of two manuscripts, or rather on the authority of imperfect writing in two manuscripts of very little authority in themselves, we have *flumina illa* for *flumina ulla* ; though there is no previous allusion to rivers, to which *illa* can be referred ; and the general sense of the context so obviously and decidedly requires *ulla*, that the editor would without doubt have adopted it from other manuscripts and old editions, had later editors received the other pronoun, and all the gall of his ink would scarcely have been bitter enough for his abuse of them.

L. 11. 631. Bentley having in some manuscripts found *fleti*, and in others *freti*, for *læti*, though he rejects both, yet the former is eagerly seized and inserted into the text, for no other apparent reason than that of being without either sense or syntax, and therefore supposed to contain *reconditum quiddam et exquisitum*. Had he condescended to adduce an example of such an expression as *sanguine fleti*, we might have been tempted to examine how far it is a proper nominative for *ludunt* and *exultant*.

L. 11. 692. is extremely obscure, but nevertheless both *eadem* and *iisdem*, the readings of the best manuscripts and editions, afford meaning, the one if referred to *verba*, and the other to *litteris* ; but his conjectural *eidem* seems to afford none ; nor does his note supply any at all consistent with the text.

L. 11. 740. From manuscripts of little or no authority, we have here *numina* for *lumina solis*—*despexere* ; though who ever looked down upon (*despexit*) *numina solis*—*the deities of the sun* ; on whose light we can only look down when it shines on objects beneath our eyes ?

L. 11. 1167-8. are bungling interpolations ; the second heni-stich of the editor's own manufacture, and the rest by a workman of the same class : but their having been rejected and omitted in preceding editions, was a sufficient motive for restoring them ; as their retention would have been for ejecting them.

L. 111. 190. *fluitat* unnecessarily and improperly written *fluat*, the u and i being perpetually joined in a diphthong and pronounced as one syllable in *tenuis* and other words.

L. 111. 347. *reposito* is received for *reposta*, on the authority probably of the imperfectly-formed or half-obliterated letters of some manuscripts ; and the strange expression *alvo reposto*, justified by Virgil's *terras repostas*, and Horace's *latentem matris in alvo* ; the first of which is quite irrelevant, and the second fa-

vors the generally received reading—*alvoque reposta*—condemned as *doctè minus et exquisitè*, because consistent with common sense.

L. III. 522. If *rationis* be preferred to the reading of Pius, *rationi*, there should be a comma after the preceding word *falsæ*, which must be joined with *rei* understood.

L. III. 976. *Incilet* should be written *incillet*, for which there is sufficient authority cited in the note.

L. III. 1082. Here the editor has exceeded all his former feats in substituting *obit* to *odit*, without a shadow or semblance of authority, and in defiance alike of metrie, sense, and grammar. The poet, after describing, with his usual vigor and vivacity, the restlessness of a man flying from his own vacuity, and seeking for change of mind in change of place, (1073—80.) adds, “In this manner each flies himself; but whom he cannot fly out of, he still unwillingly sticks to and hates,” with which the editor not being satisfied, replaces *odit* with *obit*, which he interprets *obversatur, circumit, se opponit*; without, however, producing a single example to authorise the Latinity of such an expression as *se obire*, or the metrical license of doubling the B (which was never pronounced double either in Greek or Latin,¹) and reading *obit*—*obbit*; for that of *obex* is wholly irrelevant, being derived from *objicio*, and written at length *objex*. Even when elided, the metrical power of the j is still retained, so that in all its forms the first syllable is invariably long, whereas that of *obeo* and its derivatives is invariably short, except in this instance of true British manufacture. The Latinity too of *se opponit* by which it is explained, belongs to the same sample, the author meaning, I suppose, *se sibi opponit*. It is strange that the obtruder of so vile an interpolation should, in the note to it, harshly condemn the *licentiam temerariam, et Lucretii amatoribus minimè tolerabilem* of his predecessors, who had given *angit* for *odit*; since they had at least preserved to their author grammar, sense, and metre; whereas he has deprived him of all three.

L. IV. 549. His hand being now in, according to the vulgar phrase, he is determined that it shall not lose its habitude through want of exercise, and this verse being defective and evidently corrupt in all his manuscripts, affords him ample scope for all the temerity of conjectural alteration. The reading of the common editions is *vallibus et cygni gelidis orti ex Heliconis*; which, though the editor finds it rugged and inelegant,

¹ See Proleg. in Hom., published in a preceding Number of this Journal, s. clxx.

seems to be only objectionable in the want of authority for the epithet *gelidis*; which is, however, most elegantly supplied by the reading of better manuscripts cited by Pius, adding only the final *s* to the word *detorti*, from which it had probably been obliterated by time or accident.

Vallibus et cygni detortis ex Heliconis affords a sense consistent with the elegance and precision of the poet in the use of epithets; crooked valleys with abrupt turns bounded by high and bare rocks, such as those of Mount Helicon, being apt to reverberate and prolong sounds; whence may have arisen the Fable of that mountain being the seat of the muses. This, however, is too plain and simple to satisfy the prurient ears of our editor; who, finding in his own written rubbish *nece tortis* for *detortis*, is determined that an expression so exquisite and recondite shall be duly honored, and therefore remodels the whole verse into a form which would have made Lucretius stop his ears, and look like the enraged musician. *Et valli cygnis, nece tortis, ex Heliconis*: nor would he have been less puzzled with the construction than offended by the sound: for though *torti usque ad necem* might have been horribly familiar to him, *nece torti* would probably have been new; especially when employed to signify the tranquil death—the euthanasia—supposed to be denoted by the expiring melodies of the swan.

L. iv. 619. *Qui*, which the editor receives instead of *quo*, should, for the sake of consistency, be printed, as in other places, *quí*: but after the specimens of his own modesty, which we have been exhibiting, his invective against the audacity of preceding editors for changing this archaic *quí* into *quo* is quite ludicrous.

L. iv. 989. *Lactant* is a mere error of the press here for *jactant* in the Venetian edition; though in its place, and justly, restored by our editor in a subsequent passage. L. v. 1067. Dogs do fondle and caress (*lactant*) their puppies with their paws; but do not caress or fondle their own legs, when dreaming of pursuing other animals in the chase; but throw them out (*jactant*) in their visionary efforts to run. The alteration produces utter nonsense, which the editor's usual eagerness for innovation, caused him not to perceive.

L. iv. 1020. *Purei* received for *puerei* or *pueris*, because forming a spondee; and defended by the absurd derivation from *purus*: but the vowels *ue* form one long syllable in many other words, and *puer* is derived from the Greek *κῶρος* through the medium of other ancient dialects of Italy.¹

¹ See Proleg. in Hom., published in a preceding Number of this Journal, s. cxxix.

L. v. 30—2. The note of interrogation at the end of the first line, and the crochets enclosing the two parts of the second and third, should be, without hesitation, removed: for though *Stymphalides* may signify the birds of the lake Stymphalus, without any explanatory adjunct, *Stymphala colentes*, without the preceding explanation, would signify the human inhabitants of its borders.

L. v. 448. *Secretam, humorque*, received partly from corrupt manuscripts and partly from conjecture, instead of *secreto humore*, which is first misunderstood and then altered; *secreto*, not being, as the editor supposes, to be taken as an adverb, but as a participle, which gives the clearest and plainest sense—*seorsum mare uti, secreto humore, pateret*. Whilst his alteration, of which he boasts the elegance, affords none at all but by a construction very unworthy of the poet.

L. v. 589. The composites are usually written by him in the archaic manner separately and at length, as *alteram utram* is here: but soon after (684.) we find *utrutrâ* in the more recent and common form. Either the one or the other should be constantly adhered to in one individual work.

L. v. 733. *Aliâ* is an error of the press for *alia*.

L. v. 947. *Excibant* is substituted to *exibant*, contrary to the best authority, in defiance of all elegance of construction and collocation, and in direct contradiction to the poet's system; which allows no such office to the nymphs, or any other divine personages; but accounts, very much at length, for the secretion of waters through the earth, by natural and necessary causes.

L. v. 965. *Conflictabantur* for *consectabantur*, altered from a manifest misprint, *conflectabantur*, in the Verona edition, said by himself to be *omni genere corruptelarum refertissima*; and received into the text, in an active sense, against all authority, and in violation of all sense and syntax. A depravation so monstrous and insulting is perhaps without example, except in these rash and hasty effusions of one who is perpetually contrasting his own modest timidity with the impudent temerity of his predecessors. The authority cited from Cicero, to be at all applicable, should, instead of *conflictavisset*, have been *conflictatus esset rempublicam*, a specknen of Latinity from which even he would probably have shrunk.

L. v. 968. *Subus* for *suibus*; the *i* being dropped on insufficient authority.

L. v. 995. *Privarant* received from manuscripts in defiance of all analogy of tense for *privarunt*. The other manuscripts of more authority give *privabant*, the precise tense, which the

context requires, and which would probably be found in the manuscripts that have misled the editor, if more carefully inspected.

L. v. 1000. *Nec*, he says, is the reading of all the old copies; therefore it may be prudent to retain it instead of *sed*, till something better occur, though it requires a mode of construction, which the idiom of the language can scarcely admit.

L. v. 1038. Finding the unusual form *proporro* in some manuscripts and editions, he is determined to receive it in spite of all laws of prosody; and therefore contracts *alittum* into *alittum*, by which, however, nothing is gained; since the latter cannot, any more than the former, be contracted into two syllables, which his metre absolutely requires.

L. v. 1163. Is a manifestly spurious line, pronounced to be so by Fabre and Bentley; and therefore ought to have been enclosed in crochets.

L. vi. 11. For *per quæ*, which the preceding conjunction *et*, referring to *quæ* in v. 9., absolutely requires; and the approximate readings of manuscripts, *per qua* and *per quam*, fully justify, he receives from books of no authority *pro quo*; and endeavours by a construction in violation of all syntax, to join it with the context: for there is neither antecedent nor consequent either to the relative or its preposition, except in *victum* or *usus*, which no known licence of construction can join to them.

L. vi. 47-8. Seem to be incurably corrupt without the aid of better manuscripts; and perhaps the conjectural alterations made by our editor are less objectionable, because less violent, than those of his predecessors.

L. vi. 87. *Partim* for *partem* in this instance only must be wrong; and, being usually employed as an adverb, cannot be generally restored as an archaism without introducing frequent ambiguities.

L. vi. 344. *Coniciens* for *conficiens* has arisen out of a compendious way of writing, by which one letter was made to stand for two; and is, otherwise, a word of no better note than *coneo*, *coniturus*, &c. would be, if received instead of *coeo*, *coiturus*, &c.

L. vi. 393. *Vovitur* for *volvitur*, is merely a misprint, of which I have observed only two instances in the whole impression.

L. vi. 508. *Humecti* is here foisted into the text by mere conjecture instead of *vi venti*, a manifest interpolation from the succeeding line, though a respectable manuscript offered *humenti*, the best possible word, and the syntax absolutely required the sixth case—*confertæ*, or more properly *confertæ nube humenti*, *Clouds filled with humid matter*: but this is plain and grammatical, and therefore sacrificed to a conjectural alteration,

which is neither; *confertus* with a genitive being a mere barbarism, for which no shade or semblance of authority is offered.

L. vi. 514-5. Are obscure and probably corrupt: but the editor has done wisely in leaving them for future discoveries without admitting conjectural emendations of his own or others. Inestimable would have been his edition had he been guided in all instances by similar discretion.

L. vi. 624. *Ventei* negligently repeated from the preceding line for *ponti*, and continued in some manuscripts, is eagerly seized upon and introduced as one of those elegant repetitions of which the poet was fond; though in a situation where both the sense and collocation of the words render it most crude and inelegant, the passage being one of dry argument, whereas such repetitions belong to the ardor of passion and glow of enthusiasm.

L. vi. 791-2. Finding in some of his manuscripts, *acris* for *acri* at the end of the first of these two lines, he boldly makes a place for it, by two most outrageous conjectural alterations in the second, *nidor subfundit* for *nidore offendit*, and *cogit* for *sopit*: both in direct violation of syntax, which, indeed, never stands in his way, when he attacks it pen in hand. *Nidor se subfundit naribus*, or *nidore subfundit nares*, would be Latin, but not *nidor subfundit nares*; and *nidor* is not sufficiently substantial to precede *cogit*, at least without the sanction of safe authority. The true reading of the passage is probably

Nocturnumque recens extinctum lumen, ubi acri

Nidore offendit narcis, tum sopit ibidem;

Considerare ut pronos qui morbus mittere suevit.¹

At least it is both grammatical and intelligible; and therefore, as every word is sanctioned by the authority of Manuscripts and old editions, ought to be retained.

L. vi. 800. The archaic *flueris* from *fluo*, which he approves in his Notes, ought without hesitation to have been received into the Text for *fueris*: but having exhausted all his energy in the preceding heroic effort, he dares not venture to adopt an obvious and necessary emendation sanctioned by the best authority.

L. vi. 890. Here, however, he suddenly recovers his temerity and inserts *est* without necessity or expediency, or any shadow or semblance of authority: for though the first syllable of *aradus* be short, the first of *aradio*, might, by a well-known licence, be pronounced long, as that of *Britanni* is in v. 1104. It is not, however, quite so certain that the final *io* would be contracted into one syllable: for the example which is cited from Homer,

¹ Such junctions of two infinitives are not uncommon in the early poets. See Plaut. Mil. Glor. Act ii. Sc. 1. vs. 48. &c.

Αἰγυπτιή is utterly irrelevant. We now indeed know that the prosody of the old bard did not, like that of his successors, allow a vowel to be short before *πτ* : but the ancient critics do not appear to have observed these obsolete peculiarities : but to have adapted his metre, as nearly as they could, to their own respective modes of pronouncing : so that the rhapsodists of Pisistratus, Dionysius, and Alexander, read *Αἰγυπτιή*, in which they were of course followed by the grammarians of the age of Lucretius.

L. vi. 953—8. are unintelligibly corrupt in every individual manuscript and old edition, and the emendations, by which they have since acquired meaning, amount to a complete remodelling of the text. These our Editor has wisely rejected ; but by a most injudicious alteration of his own—*cæli* into *colli*—and by a no less injudicious selection of readings from old copies, he has left the text more unintelligible, and more ungrammatical, than he found it. In such cases the only safe way is, wholly to renounce conjecture ; constitute a text out of the best selection that the judgment of the Editor can form ; place the other authorized readings at the bottom of the page ; and trust to time for further elucidation. On this plan I recommend the following, not as satisfactory, but as the most probable that genuine authority can supply :

vaporosque

Ignis, qui ferri quoque vim penetrare suævit.
Denique, qua circum cæli lorica coeret ;
Morbida visque simul, quom extrinsecus insinuat ;
Et tempestates, terrâ cæloque coactæ,
In cælum terramque remote, jure facessunt ;
Quandoquidem nihil est, nisi raro corpore nexum.

To make sense, *faresso* must of course be taken in the archaic sense of *retiring* or *withdrawing*, and *jus* for the *law* of *physical necessity*.

L. vi. 974. The *i* unnecessarily dropt from *suibus*, which may be contracted into two short syllables.

L. vi. 1003 and 1015. *Fæcëfit*, which the Editor introduces from authorities of no validity in such matters, is in nowise better than *strenëfit* would be ; and, according to his plan of constituting the text, it should be written separately—*vacue fit*.

L. vi. 1030. *Naxem* is here arbitrarily changed in the nominative plural, *naxes*, and the punctuation altered, so as to save, by a forced and crude construction, the following line, which Lambin and Bentley had justly condemned as an interpolation. The true reading is manifestly—*trudit et impellit, quasi navem velaque ventis*, where the paragraph should end, and v. 1031 be expunged, or enclosed in crochets.

112 *Corrections of Wakefield's Lucretius.*

A new edition of Lucretius being about to appear among the *Delphin and Variorum Classics*, for which this of Mr. Wakefield must necessarily be the foundation, I have thought it due to the publishers and the public, that these instances of negligent inconsistency, gross error, and wanton interpolation, should be pointed out and exposed, that they may not be repeated. Others may discover still more, or may propose better substitutes for these here examined, for I do not pretend to have made any regular collation of the text, nor have any other object in view than the restoration of its purity; to which whosoever shall contribute, even by the detection of errors of my own, shall share my gratitude, with that of other admirers of a poet who, in fertility of imagination, and brilliancy and variety of illustration, is the second—and in depth, energy, and justness of thought, and in vigor, perspicuity, conciseness, and precision of expression, the first, of all poets.

This opinion of him is however directly contrary to that which is generally circulated under the authority of one who must necessarily have been a better judge of the general merits of a Latin poet than it is possible for any modern critic to be, namely, of Cicero; but this contrariety is entirely owing to one of those impudent interpolations, against which our Editor is constantly inveighing, and which he is constantly practising. Quintus Cicero had, it seems, in a letter to his brother Marcus written at the time of the poem's first publication, admired the splendors of genius displayed in it; to which Marcus in his answer entirely assents, but adds, that there *was nevertheless much of art*. *Lucretii poemata ita sunt, ut scribis, multis luminibus ingenii; multa tamen artis*,¹ in which the conjunction *tamen* naturally connects the additional observation of Marcus to the original one of Quintus: but a dashing Editor not perceiving this, and therefore concluding that it wanted an antecedent, most rashly and impudently inserted *non alter scribis*; which having been retained by most of his successors, the passage is now commonly quoted as an instance of the great orator's want of skill and discernment in poetry. He was, indeed, a very bad poet, and a most fond and partial admirer of his own frothy verses, as many other such versifiers have been; but, nevertheless, neither he nor his brother were so blind to the merits of others as to blame a poem for the want of that particular excellence for which it is most pre-eminent.

This instance alone should make all Editors cautious in receiving or repeating conjectural alterations. R. P. K.

¹ L. ii. Ep. 11.

ODE.

Τῷ ἐκλαμπροτάτῳ ἀνδρὶ
 ἙΡΡΙΚΩΙ ΦΡΑΝΚΙΣΚΩΙ ΤΩΙ ΔΑΓΕΣΣΕΙ
 Τῷ καθόλου Βασιλικῷ Προκουράτῳ
 ὈΔΗ.
 (ἔτει αψβ'.)

ΔΤΩΔΕΚΑΣ α'.

ΛΙΘΟΜΕΝΑΙΣΙ μενοιναῖς
 ἱαμνάμενον κέαρ, ὄρμα
 πνεῖν μέγ', ὦ Μοῖσ', ὀξεία τε
 χρὴ ὑπακουσέμεν ἀ-
 νάγκα, καὶ ὠκεία φθάσαι
 αἰετὸν ἱπτάμενον
 ἀλκᾷ νοδὸς, ὄμματος ἀργοῦ ἄρπαγε,
 ὃς τάχει τ' ἤλεγξε καμόντας ἀήτας,
 κ' ὠχριάσαντα λίπεν
 10) ὠκύπτερος φθόνῳ Φαέ-
 θοντ', ἀκήης νικαφόρου θ'
 ἱρμᾶς ἐπόπταν.

Δ. β'.

Ἀλλὰ τὸ, πότνια Μοῖσα,
 15) ζεῦξον εὐπτερον ἄλκαρ
 φροντίδων αἶψα τολμῆρᾶν,
 ὄφρα Δαγессέα κε-
 λεύθῳ διώξω ἐν φανῇ,
 πτήσῃ δαιδαλέῃ
 ὕμνων. Ἀρετὰν δὲ σὺν ἀγνώ-
 20) ὕμνέειν ἔγω πέλεν ὕβριος· ἐντὶ
 δ' ἀμερίοις σφαλεραὶ
 γινῶμαι, ξένην αἴσαν κλέουσ
 λαμπρὰν φθονήεντι σκοτῶ
 σιγαῶς καλύπτειν.

Δ. γ'.

- 35 Ἡ ῥα κενόφρονες εὐχαλ
 ὀξύτάταις μανίαις θέλ-
 γοντι θνατῶν φρένας, τυφλῶ
 τ' ἤτορι ἐσλὰ ῥέοντ',
 ὥχρὸν τε πλοῦτον διψάσι
 30 φροντίσιν ὑμνέομεν·
 ὄλβος δ' ἀρετᾶς (σὲ μὲν ἀγνὰν ματέρα,
 Παλλὰς, ἐσλῶν μαρτύρομαι) παρὰ θνατοῖς
 ἔσχατος ἔσχε κλέους
 μοῖραν, νεμεσσῶν ᾧ γ' ἐγὼ
 35 σπείδω ἐπασκῆσαι κλυταῖς
 ἥρωα τιμαῖς·

Δ. δ'.

- ὃς νοδὸς ὑψιβάτοιο
 δεξιὸν ὄμμα τιταίνων,
 ἤπτετο φρεσὶ πυκναῖσιν
 40 ἀντυγος οὐρανοῦ,
 θυμῷ λιπὼν αἶαν, καὶ ἀ-
 γνὸν φάος ἀντλεῖν ἐκ
 παγᾶς καθαρᾶς ἀκιχῆτου λάμπειος·
 ἰδρις ὑψηλᾶς σοφίας καὶ ἀφάντου,
 45 ἄν γε φυλασσομένοις
 ἴσσοισιν ὅπτονται βροτοὶ,
 αἶγλης ἀγυμνάστου βολαῖς
 δαμέντες ἤτορ.

Δ. ε'.

- Κεῖθεν ἀγναῖς νόον ἔρσας
 50 ἐγκύμον' Ἴρι Δαγεσσεὺς
 ᾤρθ' ἐλὼν, γῇ τ' ἰάλλει ὄμ-
 βρον καθαρᾶς σοφίας,
 τὰν Κελτικὰν τέρπων χυτᾶ
 ἀμβροσίᾳ πραπίδων,
 55 ἥ ἀμφέβαλεν κλέος ὄλβου ἄφθιτον·
 οἶφ φαντὶ Ζῆνι πάτ' Ἀφροδίτας παῖδ',

- 60 Ἰταλίαν γε Ἴϋδον
στῆναι, βυθῶν εὖτ' εὐρέων·
βλάσταν θαλάσσας, ἀλίω
φάνθη τε νύμφα.

Δ. ε'.

- 65 Ζεὺς τότε ἦ νιφάδεσσι
στοίβας' ἀγᾶνορα χρυσόν,
ἕμβρον ὀλβοιο ἐν ξανθᾷ
τᾷ νεφέλᾳ πυκάσας,
νάσῳ τε ὥπασσεν τέχνας,
ἴσσετε κυδιάνειρ'
ἄνδρεςσι φιλεῖ σοφίῃ τεύχειν γλυκί'.
'Ἄλλ' ἐὰν πάτρων καθαρῶσι Δαγέσσενος
70 • νάμασι τέγγε κλέους,
χρυσοῖο πλούτῳ κρέσσονι
τὰν ὀλβίσας φήμας, ἀρε-
τᾶν τε κλεεννᾶν.

Δ. ζ'.

- 75 'Ελλάς ὅσ' Αὐσονίῃ τε
ἀγλαὰ ἄνθεμα γαῖα
δρέψατο γνώσεων τερπνᾶν,
λέξατο δ' ὅσσα γένης
φυλ' ἔξορ', Αἰγυπτίς θ' ὅσας
ἔνθετο χεῖρ σάνισι,
καὶ πλαξὶ χάραξέ ποτ', εἰν αἰνίγμασι
80 νυκτὶ καὶ σεμνᾷ κεκαλυμμένης ὀμφᾶς,
θέσφατα δ' ὅσσα θέτο
αἰῶν, κυλίνδων ῥεύματι
θνητοὺς χρόνου, θεσμοῖσι τε
μέτροις τε ὥρᾶν,

Δ. η'.

- 85 πεντάσιν ἑπτά ἐτῶν (οὐ
ψεύδει τὰν φρένα τέγγω)
φέρβεται, πάνθ' ἐλών κόλποις,

- καὶ ταμίευσε νόῳ
 εὖρεϊ Δαγασσεύς· οὐ τέ μιν
 90 λάνθανε Σικελικαῖς
 γραμμαῖν ἵχνι' ἐν ψαμάθοις, νημερτέϊ
 νῶ χαραχθέντ'. οὐκ ἰδεῶν φύγεν ὄχλος,
 αἰ πέλον ἔμβρυα ἐ-
 ναργῶν ἀμυδρὰ πραγμάτων,
 95 ἀλλ' αἰπὺν ἤπλωσε νόον,
 καὶ δρέψ' ἄωτον,

Δ. θ'.

- ὣν ἅπας ἴδμεναι ἔλδεν,
 ἔκ γε φυᾶς βροτός· Αὐτὰρ
 μουσικὰν τοῖσι συζεύξας
 100 ἀγλαΐαν, μελέτα
 τερπνᾶ, κλέη ἐσλῶν ἅπαντ'
 ἤτορι ἀμφίσπεν.
 Ἡ γὰρ πέλεν ὄλβιος, ὅς γ' οἶδεν βίον
 μουσικαῖς ἀρμοζέμεν αἰὲν ἀνάγκαις.
 105 Ἀκμονος ἐκ, Πυθαγό-
 ρα ἤλυθον σφυρήλατοι
 ῥυθμοὶ, μέλος τε οἱ ἐχάλ-
 κευσεν σίδηρος,

Δ. ι'.

- ἅπλετα χερσὶν ἀμούσως
 110 τυπτόμενος. Πολύϊδρις
 ἔπλεθ', ὃς θῆκεν ἐν φρεσσὶν,
 αἰμερίου τε τύχας,
 καΐας παλιρροῖαν κέαρ
 κρέσσον ἔχειν, διαφώ-
 115 νοις ἐν τε ῥοπαῖσι, ἱαλαντεύσας νόον
 ἄρεν ὑψοῦ νυμὸν ἐναρμόνιον. Τὸ
 δ' εὐπραγίαισι κομῶν,
 σεμνὸν, θαητόν τ' ὦ μέλημ'
 ἀνδρесси, κῆρ εὐχορδον εἰς
 120 ὠφθης κεράσσας

Δ. ια'.

- ἁρμονικαῖς χαρίτεσσι,
 σοί τε ὁμόφρονα λεῶν
 ἐμπέδωσας παθῶν, τεύξας
 ἐνδόσιμον φίλοφρον
 125 λαοῖσιν εἰράνας σεμναῖς,
 ἄρτια μηδόμενος,
 ἐχθράν θ' ὕβριος τρίβον ἀγνοῖς ἵχνεσι
 ψυχᾶς διώκων, μετανίσσεται αἰῶν
 εὐδιον ἐν κλέεσι,
 130 ὀλβω καὶ ὑψηλῷ τὸν οὐ
 μάρψει φθόνος θάλλοντα λυσ-
 σάεντ' ὀδόντι.

Δ. ιβ'.

- "Αλιον ἰοβόλω τίς
 γάρ ποτε δάγματα βάψεν;
 135 κινδύνου ἐντὶ γυμνὰ τεῦ
 ἔργματα, ἥε Δίκας
 κραινθέντα βουλαῖς, βάσσανος
 ἀτρεκέων τελέθει,
 καὶ θῆκε σ' ἀγνὸν Θέμιδος μύσταν ἔμεν.
 140 Τὸ δ' εὐνόμῳ ἤτορι ἦς τ' αἶδυτ' εἰσδὺς
 θέσφατα ἀμπέτασας
 ἄμμιν νόμων, τοῖσι πτόλεις
 ἤθη τε θάλλουσι βροτῶν
 144 ἐσλῶν ἑέρσαις.

ἌΝΤΩΝΙΟΣ ὁ ΚΟΡΑΗΣ, ὁ ΧΙΟΣ.

INVENTION OF PRINTING:

*Pretensions of Laurens Koster, of Haarlem,
 Invention of Printing with Moveable Types.*

A SHORT discussion on the invention of the art of Printing, and a statement of the arguments, by which that invention is attributed to a native of Holland, may perhaps not be unacceptable to the readers of the Classical Journal. My attention was drawn to this

subject when I was at Haarlem, in September 1815. In the market-place of that town is to be seen the statue of one of its former inhabitants, LAWRENCE COSTER, or, as he is called at full length in Dutch, *Laurens Janszoon Koster*. On the pedestal of this statue is the following inscription :

“Æ. M. S.

Laurentio Costero, Harlcensi, viro consulari, typographiæ inventori vero, monumentum hoc erigi curavit Collegium Medicum
C15 10CCXXII.”

Adjoining the market-place, near the statue, the house in which Koster lived is to be seen. In front of this house, in the gable-end, (for the houses in Holland are frequently built with their gable-ends forward,) there is a similar record upon a tablet, in these words :

“M. S.

Viro Consulari, Laurentio Costero, Harlemensi, typographiæ inventori, circa annum MCCCCXXX.”

In these inscriptions, Lawrence Koster, of Haarlem, is proclaimed as the inventor of the art of printing, and the opinion that he really was so prevails throughout Holland. To one who had never before considered the grounds on which that opinion rests, it was natural that so interesting a subject should afford occasion of enquiry, especially when it was suggested on the very spot to which it relates. No opportunity of farther investigation occurred while I remained at Haarlem; but I retained the topic in my mind, and when I arrived, subsequently, at Leyden, determined to avail myself of the information which the learned men of that city might be able to communicate. I accordingly mentioned the subject to two gentlemen of that university, Messrs. VAN KAMPEN and WILLIAM HENRY TYDEMAN, both distinguished for their learning and extensive knowledge. Mr. Van Kampen, with whom I first conversed, stated, that Hadrianus Junius, a Dutch writer of the 16th century, had directed the attention of his countrymen to the claims of Koster: that these claims were founded, 1. on a tradition, handed down from generation to generation, concerning his invention of printing; 2. on certain specimens of old printing attributed to him, which are preserved, according to Mr. Van Kampen's account, in the town-hall of Haarlem. He added, that it was part of the tradition alluded to, that one of Koster's journeymen, or workmen, eloped from him, carrying with him the types invented by his master, and other articles of the printing apparatus, and withdrew to Meitz, where he betrayed the secret of his master's art, and set up a printing establishment, which gave rise to those other typographical institutions at Meitz that subsequently attained so much celebrity. Mr. Van Kampen referred me for farther information to the *Origines typographicæ* of Gerardus Meerman. Nearly the same intelligence I obtained from Mr. Tydeman, who likewise recommended Meerman. He farther showed me a book,

written in Dutch, by *Henry Gockinga*, on the invention of printing, taken from Meerman's Latin work, and accompanied with the notes of the editor.¹ Besides this, he mentioned a treatise on that subject, in a periodical work, called *Mnemosyne*, which is edited by himself and Mr. Van Kampen. And lastly he observed, that a Mr. COGAN, an Englishman, in a book, describing a tour along the Rhine, had adverted to this topic, and taken a very just view of it. This publication I have not had an opportunity of consulting; but I purchased, at Leyden, the work called *Mnemosyne*,² and what I shall communicate respecting the subject in question is chiefly derived from this source. There are, however, several other writers, who throw a considerable light on all the details that belong to this argument. They are: "Van Oosten de Bruyn, *Geschiedenis der Stad Haarlem*," (History of the Town of Haarlem); "Daunou, *Analyse des Opinions diverses sur l'Origine de l'Imprimerie*," in *Mémoires de l'Institut National des Sciences et des Arts*, Tome 4; "Wolfii Monumenta Typographica;" "Jansen, *Histoire de l'Origine de l'Imprimerie*;" "Lambinet, *Recherches sur l'Origine de l'Imprimerie, et sur ses premiers établissements dans la Belgique*;" "Marchand, in *Annalibus Hirsaugiensibus*;" "Santandra de Serra, *Dictionnaire Bibliographique*;" "Seiz, *Derde Jubeljaar der uitgevordene Boekdrukkunst*," (Third Jubilee of the Invention of the Art of Printing); "Breitkopf, *über die Geschichte der Erfindung der Buchdruckerkunst*," (on the History of the Invention of the Art of Printing); and lastly, the following important work, "*Initia Typographica illustravit Jo. Frid. Lichtenberger*," published at Strasburg and Paris, 1811, 4to. by Treuttel and Würtz.

The honor of this important invention has been claimed by several places, in different parts of Europe. Those, whose pretensions have the best foundation, are Haarlem, Mentz, and Strasburg. Other towns, that offer themselves as competitors for that distinction, Augsburg, Basil, Bologna, Feltri, Florence, Lubeck, Rome, have no adequate pleas in their favor. They can exhibit some old

¹ The title is: "Uitvinding der Boekdrukkery, gebroken uit het Latynsch werk van Gerard Meerman, met eene Voorrede en aantekeningen, van Hendrik Gockinga. Hierachter is gevoegen eene Lyst der Boeken in de Nederlanden gedrukt voort Jaar M. D. opgesteld door Visser." i. e. "The invention of printing, taken from the Latin work of Gerard Meerman, with a preface, and notes, by Henry Gockinga. After this is subjoined a list of books printed in the Netherlands before the year 1500, drawn up by Visser."

² The title of this interesting publication is: "Mnemosyne; Mengelingen voor Wetenschappen en Fraaye Letteren; verzameld door Mr. H. W. Tydeman en N. G. Van Kampen. 1^{ste} Stuk. Dordrecht, 1815. 8vo." i. e. "Mnemosyne; or Miscellanies for Science and Belles Lettres; collected by H. W. Tydeman, A. M. and N. G. Van Kampen. 1st Number. Dordrecht, 1815."

prints which they have produced ; but from these it is too hasty and presumptuous a step to the origin and invention of the art. The only fair candidates for that reputation are the cities of Haarlem, Mentz, and Strasburg ; and their title of priority seems to be established in the order in which they are here named. *Haarlem*, which claims to be considered as the birth-place of the art, founds her right, *first*, on the traditional account which is preserved of the invention. According to this tradition, the inventor was a man named *Laurens Janszoon Koster* ; in English, *Lawrence Johnson Koster*. Of this individual it is recorded, that he was the son of *Jan Laurenszoon*, or *John Lawrence*. It was, in those days when surnames did not generally prevail, the custom to distinguish a person by subjoining to his own Christian name that of his father, with the word *zoon*, son, annexed to the latter, as its terminating syllable. Therefore our subject was called *Laurens Janszoon*, *Lawrence* the son of *John* ; and his father had been denominated *Jan Laurenszoon*, *John* the son of *Lawrence*, as the grandson usually bore the name of the grand-father. Subsequently, a farther discrimination began to be introduced by means of surnames, as we call them. These had their origin from different sources, and, among others, from an office, trade, or occupation. Hence the man of whom we are speaking derived the appellation of *Koster*, which means *parish-clerk* ; for he was parish-clerk for many years to the principal church at Haarlem, or the church of St. Bavo. The name *Koster* might, therefore, in English, be rendered *clerk*, and the whole name expressed by *Lawrence Johnson Clerk*. We shall, however, retain the appellation of *Laurens Koster*, by which this individual has been distinguished. The year of his birth does not appear to be known, nor is that of his death ascertained. It seems likely that he died between the years 1434 and 1440. The office of parish-clerk was, at that time, both respectable and profitable, and to attend to the duties more conveniently, it seems that he took the house in the market-place, near the church. He was one of the magistrates of the town of Haarlem ;¹ a situation, however, for which it does not appear that he vacated the office of parish-clerk ; but he probably retained the latter through life, which may be concluded from the circumstance of its having furnished his surname. The year in which the art of printing was invented by him is not exactly determined.² Some say it was the year 1428, others 1440 ; the writer in *Mnemosyne* places it between 1420 and 1430. In the inscription on Koster's house, as I read it in September 1815, the year 1430 was distinctly written ; yet it seems that others read it 1428.³ The history of the invention is related by Junius, in the dedication prefixed to his

See *Mnemosyne*, p. 147.

² *Ib.* p. 150.

³ *Ib.* p. 206. note 30.

Batavia.¹ It is founded on tradition. But this tradition was by Junius derived from sources, besides the common hearsay, which were particularly entitled to credit. They were two old men, of most respectable character and station in life, who remembered one *Cornelis* or *Kornelis*,² who had been journeyman or servant to *Koster*, and from whom they had heard the particulars hereafter to be detailed. One of those two men was *Nicholas Gael*, the master or preceptor of Junius: he was of very advanced age when Junius was his pupil.³ The other was *Quirinus Talesius*,⁴ burgo-master of Haarlem, also a very old man in the time of Junius. He was the friend of Erasmus, and had been burgomaster from the year 1552: he died in 1573. It seems that Gael was acquainted with *Pieter Thomaszoon* the grandson, and particularly with *Thomas Pieterzoon* the great grand-son, of *Laurens Koster*;⁵ from whom he might have an opportunity of learning the history of the invention, and be enabled to make a comparison between their account and the narrative of *Cornelis*. Neither *Talesius* nor *Gael* could have any motive or interest to ascribe the invention to *Laurens Koster*, if the fact had not been true in their judgment. *Cornelis* himself could have no temptation to tell a falsehood:⁶ his old master was long dead, and the printing business had passed into other hands, so that no imaginable advantage could be seen in such a fiction. We cannot suppose that the story was adopted for the mere purpose of a fiction. But the general belief that prevailed at Haarlem on this subject, is likewise entitled to some weight. The house which is called *Koster's*, and the inscription with which it is marked, are proofs of the popular opinion;⁷ and it is to be observed, that this opinion was maintained, and continued without interruption, even in times of confusion and trouble,⁸ when facts of this nature might easily have sunk into oblivion. The report of Junius is as follows:⁹ "*Laurens Janszoon*, surnamed *Koster*, was, one afternoon, walking in the wood near Haarlem, and happened, while handling his knife, to cut some letters in twigs, or small branches, of beech. By reversing these letters, in the manner of a seal, he made impressions with them on paper, transferring the characters, either by means of the simple dry pressure, or by the help of some liquid. This accidental circumstance fixed *Koster's* attention, and he improved upon it by cutting in a similar manner whole lines in wood, for the purpose of using them in teaching his grand-children. He dipped these wooden characters into common ink, but found that this was too liquid, and would be blotted. This induced him to think of another medium, and to make ink

¹ *Mnemosyne*, p. 153. ² *Ib.* p. 152, 160. ³ *Ib.* p. 158. ⁴ *Ib.* p. 158.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 159.

⁶ *Ib.* p. 170.

⁷ *Ib.* p. 157.

⁸ *Ib.* p. 156.

⁹ *Ib.* p. 134, 153.

that should be more glutinous and cohesive. In this attempt he succeeded, and was enabled, not only to print off the letters upon paper or parchment, but also pictures and figures that had been cut in wood. In this way he printed a book, both with letters and with figures. It was printed only on one side, or page, of the leaf, and was the work of an anonymous writer, being in the Dutch language, and bearing the title "*De Spiegel onzer Behondenisse*," i. e. "*The Mirror of our Salvation*." Afterwards he made types in lead, and subsequently in tin or pewter, finding it necessary to have a stronger and harder material for his purpose. Laurens employed in his work the assistance of *Thomas Pieterszoon*, to whom his daughter was married. In order to make his discovery more efficient and profitable, he had occasion to extend the number of his workmen: he therefore took some persons, as journeymen, into his service, among whom was one called *John*. This man, unmindful of the fidelity due to his master, and of the oath he had taken, when he learnt his master's invention, determined to share the advantage which was likely to be derived from that invention; and watching his opportunity, one Christmas-eve, when every person was at church, slipped into his master's printing-office, and having packed up some of the types, together with the most necessary tools, secretly departed from Haarlem. He was probably aided in his enterprise by some accomplice; and he first betook himself to Amsterdam, thence to Cologne, and lastly to Mentz, where he settled, and erected a printing-office in the year 1441. He printed immediately two little books, well known at that time, and used in schools, viz. "*Alexandri Galli Doctrinale*," which was a Latin Grammar in verse; and the other book containing some small tracts, relative to Logic, by *Petrus Hispanus*. These two books were finished in the year 1442." Such is the relation of Junius. The points it contains are these: 1. Laurens Koster first cut letters in wood, and printed with them. 2. He next substituted leaden or tin letters. 3. A journeyman or workman of his robbed him of his types and implements, and carrying them, together with the secret of the art, to Mentz, there began to print books. If these points be established, or, what is next to it, protected from contradiction, there will remain no doubt that the invention of the art of printing belongs to Haarlem. The testimony afforded by the tradition itself, such as it has been stated above, goes a considerable way in the proof. There is nothing in it, to which the historian would object; no improbability in the attending circumstances; no incompetency in the sources of the tradition; no inconsistency between different reporters. The argument will be admitted as sufficient, till the contrary is proved; and if there be no attempt to controvert it, it will be considered as established. Such a task, however, is undertaken by those who advocate the cause of Mentz and Strasburg, and claim the honor of the inven-

tion for either of those cities: the pretensions of them and of Haarlem cannot stand together: it is therefore necessary to enquire, on what foundation the former rest, in order to compare them with the claims of Haarlem. The persons who are celebrated in Bibliography as the first printers, are *John Guttenberg*, *John Fust*, or *Faust*, and *Peter Schæffer* (or *Opilio*, as he calls himself, by translating his name, which means shepherd, into Latin). Of these *Guttenberg* is looked upon as the first inventor; *Fust*, as a man that supported and promoted the invention; and *Schæffer*, as an assistant, who, from a journeyman, became the son-in-law of Fust, and a partner in the concern.¹ It is further related, that some of the workmen having withdrawn to Strasburg, divulged the art, and exercised it at that place.² Another account assigns the honor of the first invention to Strasburg, alleging, that it was there made by Guttenberg, and thence carried by him to Mentz, where he greatly improved it.³ Though these accounts contradict each other in the place, they agree in the inventor, which both allow to have been *John Guttenberg*, supposed by some to have been the same person with *John Gensfleisch*.⁴ Another point that seems to be conceded is, that the first attempt of what is called printing was made with wooden types, and that Guttenberg originally printed with them.⁵ By these I mean moveable wooden letters, with which the first printed edition of the Bible, which issued from Guttenberg's press, was probably executed.⁶ Whether Guttenberg ever printed from wooden plates, or tables, according to the mode which in modern times is called stereotype, may be doubted; though one of his historians speaks of a *Catholicon*,⁷ or *Dictionary*, that was thus printed. But the existence of such a book is to be questioned; and that art of engraving on wooden tables, and printing from them, seems to be of much earlier date. It is usually distinguished by the name of *Xylography*,⁸ i. e. writing in wood, and vestiges of it are found long before the time of Guttenberg; so that he could not boast of it as a new invention.

The *libri stampati*, which occur about a century before his time,¹⁰ or earlier, must likewise not be confounded with what we call

¹ See *Mnemosyne*, p. 139. ² *Ib.* p. 141. ³ *Ib.* p. 141.

⁴ See *Eloge historique de J. GENSFLEISCH, dit GUTTENBERG, par I. F. Née de la Rochelle*. Paris, 1811. *Lichtenberger's Initia Typographica*, p. 8. *Mnemosyne*, p. 210. n. 47 and 49. *Gensfleisch* signifies *goose-flesh*, and may have been a sort of nick-name given to Guttenberg.

⁵ *Mnemosyne*, p. 133. ⁶ *Ibid.* p. 179, and 140. ⁷ *Ib.* p. 140.

⁸ See *Lichtenberger's Initia Typographica*, p. 20. and compare *Mnemosyne*, p. 182.

⁹ See *Specimina Impressionis Tabellaris*, in *Meerman's Origines*, Vol. I. p. 217. sqq.

¹⁰ See *Mnemosyne*, p. 215. and *Lichtenberger*, p. 141.

printing, though the step from the one to the other seems to be so easy and obvious, that it is surprising so long a time should have elapsed before it was accomplished. It will be proper, in this place, to say a few words on the practice of stamping, instead of writing books, which undoubtedly was the forerunner of the art of printing. The manner in which that operation was performed, I presume, is not exactly known; but it appears likely that every letter required the distinct application of the hand. The letters were cut upon instruments called *stampilli*, or stamps, and these stamps must have been made of metal, because it seems that in many instances they were heated to make the impression; for example, when the book was to be executed in gold or silver characters. Then the process was probably similar to the mode which is used by bookbinders in lettering the backs of the books. Whether they had a contrivance to hold several letters together, as the bookbinders have in Germany,¹ so as to make the impression of them at once, or whether each letter was distinctly inprinted on the parchment, as the English bookbinders do in lettering books, may be a matter of doubt; though I should be inclined, as I have before intimated, to suppose that each letter required a separate impression, because, if the means of fastening a certain number together and imprinting them jointly had been familiar, it would have been obvious that such a conjunction of several letters might be carried to a greater extent, and near advances might have been made to our art of printing. But probably they had not such a help, or any thing like a tool resembling the type-case of the German bookbinders. This may in some degree be concluded from the imperfect means which were employed at the commencement of the art of printing, when we know that the wooden types which were first invented were tied together by means of strings.² If any more efficient mode of keeping single letters together had been

¹ The technical term for this instrument, in German, is *Schriftkasten*, type-case.

² See *Lichtenberger's Initia Typographica*, p. 101. I will quote his words: "Ad infructuosa artis tentamina referendi videntur lignei illi typi, funiculo colligati, quos cum asseribus et primordiis artis cum curâ asservasse Jo. Faustum, amicisque quandoque monstrasse, tradit ejusdem relationis auctor.—Paulus Pater anno 1710. refert: 'Ligneos typos, ex buxi frutice, perforatos in medio, ut zonâ colligari commodè possint, ex Fausti officinâ reliquos, Moguntiæ aliquando me conspexisse memini.'—Argentorati quoque Specklinus, qui obiit a. 1589, testatur se vidisse ligneos typos perforatos, ut funiculo colligari possent, quos e primi inventoris Mentelii officinâ reliquos fuisse dicit, additque eosdem haud amplius superesse. Venetiis quoque typos perforatos se vidisse Rocha memorat a. 1591, monetque primos artis inventores consuevisse characteres connectere filo, in literarum foramen immisso."

previously known, it would probably have been adopted by the first inventors of printing; though it must be allowed that this reasoning is not decisive, because it might happen, as it unquestionably often has happened, that an invention or piece of mechanism existed at a certain period, and fell into disuse, without being communicated to succeeding times. Besides, that mode of stamping books was, at the time that it was practised, by no means in general use. It was probably, in the manner in which it was employed, more troublesome than the most exquisite writing, and therefore we do not know of many books that were thus executed. Lichtenberger¹ mentions the following: 1. The celebrated silver Codex of the four Gospels, translated into the Gothic language by Ulfilas, in the 4th century, which is preserved at Upsala, in Sweden.² 2. A Latin Codex of the Four Evangelists, preserved at Verona, and edited by Blanchinus in his *Evangeliarium Quadruplex*, in the year 1748.³ 3. A Psalterium, in the library of St. Germain, at Paris.⁴ The two learned Benedictines, the authors of the "Nouveau Traité de Diplomatique," did not believe⁵ the fact, that books had ever been impressed in that manner. It was a learned Swede of the name of Ihre⁶ who first entertained that idea, from contemplating the Codex of Ulfilas. He observed, in the first place, that there was a considerable impression made in the parchment by the letters, more than could have been done by a pen or reed, and that where the silver with which the letters were written was worn away, or had peeled off, still the figures of the letters remained perfect, on account of the impression made on the parchment. To this impression it was owing that the space between the lines was rough and uneven to the touch, because the edges of the letters were somewhat elevated by the impression. Secondly, the letters, which are all capital, are so exactly alike, that not the least difference between one type and the other, representing the same character of the alphabet, can be perceived; an exactness which could not possibly have been attained by the hand of the most expert writer or penman. These arguments appear to me very strong; but they did not convince the authors of

¹ *Initia Typographica*, p. 142.

² This Codex, which is one of the greatest literary curiosities, was published at Stockholm in the year 1671, under the title: "Evangelia ab Ulfilâ ex Græco Gothice translata, cum versionibus." A fac-simile of the characters is to be seen in the preface to the 4th volume of the *Nouveau Traité de Diplomatique*, p. iv.

³ Blanchinus describes it in the *Evangeliarium Quadruplex*, Tom. ii. pp. 597, 599. This *Evangeliarium* was published at Rome 1748. fol.

⁴ See Lichtenberger, p. 143.

⁵ See the preface of that work, Vol. iv. p. iii.

⁶ In his "*Ulfilas Illustratus*," published at Stockholm in 1752.

the "*Nouveau Traité de Diplomatique*." These learned men answer, *first*, that they have consulted a skilful artist, who was an engraver and letter-founder, and that this man had declared it to be impossible to print a book on vellum such as that of *Ulphilas* with heated iron punches; and *secondly*, that as to the exact likeness of the characters, it is surprising what a practised penman will be able to do. It seems, however, that these answers are not sufficient to overthrow Mr. Ihre's supposition. The impossibility of stamping such a book as *Ulphilas*, must be conceived to arise from two causes; the one, that the parchment would not bear a succession of impressions such as would fill a whole page with characters and words, because the parchment would probably be affected and injured by the application of so much heat; it might, for instance, contract and shrivel; and the *second*, that it would be an operation too laborious to be imagined, that the letters should by such a manipulation have been fixed on the vellum. To remove the first objection, it need only be remarked that there was no occasion to apply much heat at once: a certain number of letters or words might be fixed on the parchment at a time, as many as it would bear without being affected; a short interval might be allowed for the parchment to recover its tone, before the operation was repeated. But even this expedient is not necessary; for it seems to be gratuitously assumed, that that mode of impression would have such an effect. Meerman tried the experiment, and printed a leaf of parchment, on both sides, with golden characters, in the manner alluded to, without finding that those consequences ensued.¹ It should have been recollected, that the heat to be applied to the parchment is not required to be great; the type, or punch, need be little more than warm to make the impression; it is evident that it ought not to be very hot, because it would singe the parchment. The other ground on which the Benedictines rest their opposition is, that the identical appearance of the letters is to be explained from the skill and expertness of the transcribers. But this argument will scarcely be allowed. Let a hand be ever so steady, and ever so much exercised, it must be doubted, that on a minute inspection no difference in the tracing and expression of the letters would be discovered. No writing can stand such a test; it is only the dead unchangeable type which will be invariable. On the second objection, to which we have alluded, the authors of the *Nouveau Dictionnaire de Diplomatique* have not touched; but it would be a plausible allegation: namely, the immense labor it must have been to have produced a book by impressing the single letters, or few at a time, by the hand, on the parchment. This

¹ See *Origines Typographicæ*, Vol. 1. p. 4. as quoted by Lichtenberger, p. 143.

labor may undoubtedly have been great, but it is by no means incredible. Those who are acquainted with the performances of the monks in the execution and embellishment of their books, would express no wonder: the labor which they frequently employed is astonishing. In the *Nouveau Dictionnaire de Diplomatique* are to be found many examples illustrative of this fact. Where their devotion and religious zeal were interested, their exertions and perseverance knew no bounds. Hence the labor of printing the Holy Gospels, letter by letter, by the hand, if this have been the operation, would not deter them. The editors of the *Dictionnaire* must have been aware of this; and for this reason perhaps it is that an argument so specious and obvious has by them been omitted. How the monks were led to think of stamping instead of writing a book, may not be difficult to explain. The stamps, that is, the tools with which impressions of letters were made, were of old date; even the Romans used them, though probably never for the purpose of printing books, but only to affix certain marks. The Benedictines mention them, and observe that they are found, both with letters cut inwards, and raised.¹ In the British Museum several specimens of them are preserved, consisting not of single characters, but of words: in looking at which one cannot help wondering, that such means as were in use should not have led, at an earlier period, to the invention of printing. They were, however, calculated to suggest to the monks that process, of which we are speaking. It enabled them to produce letters of that uniformity and accuracy, which they could not so easily attain by the pen; and if it were nothing more than the very labor and the unusual mode of executing a book, that perhaps was, in their eyes, a sufficient inducement. How this stamping business may have been carried on, is to be seen in a bookbinder's shop in England, when the workmen are employed in lettering the backs of books. Each stamp has only one letter or character, and by this means whole words are without difficulty imprinted, with a regularity that has been acquired by practice. The foregoing observations will show the probability that stamped books may have existed, and that *Ihre's* conclusions are by no means defeated by the objections of the two Benedictines. But the *libri stampati*, as they are called in the Latin of the middle ages, occur in the remains of old records, under that denomination, as distinguished from written books. For these proofs I will refer to Lichtenberger,² as this digression has already been of considerable length.

And now to find our way back to the point from whence we

¹ See *Nouveau Traité de Diplomatique*, Tom. II., pp. 431, 432. note 4.

² *Initia Typographica*, p. 141.

digressed, it is said, that John Guttenberg's first attempt in printing was made with wooden types. The progress then was to metal types; and with these the celebrity of Guttenberg and his associates began. It will be conceding much in their favor, if it be admitted, that this great improvement, from wood to metal, in the material of the types; belongs to them: but their advocates claim the whole invention for them of all types, as instruments for printing books. This, however, is by no means established, and the very claims in behalf of Laurens Koster render that pretension doubtful. There have been other pretenders, besides Guttenberg, to whom the bare assertion, that they were the first authors of the art, cannot insure that honor. I will not go into a detail of these points, but refer those who desire particular information to the work of Lichtenberger,¹ already quoted. In the early history of Guttenberg's art, there is some confusion. He is said to have been a native of Mentz, then to have resided at Strasburg, and afterwards to have returned to Mentz.² Lichtenberger, who is an inhabitant of Strasburg, is ambitious to vindicate the honor of the invention of so important an art to his own town: and a similar bias prevails in others, from the vanity inherent in human nature, to make the countries and towns, to which they themselves belong, the seats of that invention, in order that they may themselves share the honor and the fame that result from it. This may, by a flattering appellation, be called patriotism; by one less so, prejudice; but it is, in fact, vanity and selfishness. As human nature is subject to this failing, it should always be taken into consideration, when we estimate the weight of any testimony, on such an occasion. Hence, both what the Dutch say in favor of their countryman, and what their rivals allege, in opposition to their claims, ought to be weighed with the same impartial caution. The uniform tradition, that has prevailed in Holland, respecting Laurens Koster's invention, must have had its origin in some fact; it is otherwise not to be accounted for: that which regards Guttenberg may be explained, without the necessity of setting aside the former. If we suppose that it was this man, and his associates, who improved on the original invention, brought it into notice, and more widely spread its fame, it is easy to imagine, how the merit he thus acquired might be so magnified as to make him the first inventor of the art; but it is not to be understood, how an individual, as Laurens Koster, if he had been unconnected with the invention, could have been successfully represented as a participator in those claims. The subject appears in a natural light, by assuming, that Koster invented that method of copying and multiplying

¹ *Initia Typographica*, for instance, p. 54.

² *Ibid.* p. 8. and the following pages.

books, of which we are speaking; and that Guttenberg, to whom by some means it was imparted, improved and perfected it in such a manner as to obscure the reputation of the first discoverer. On the other hand, if we attribute the first invention at once to Guttenberg, many circumstances remain which are not to be accounted for. Those who plead for Koster as the inventor of the first types, or moveable letters, need not go farther, in order to secure that honor to him, than to assert that he invented moveable wooden letters.¹ It is on this very point that the tradition, which we have before quoted, dwells: for though it adds, that Koster subsequently had substituted letters of lead, and afterwards of tin, there is not sufficient evidence that this improvement was made by himself. That the metal replaced the wooden types, was known as a fact, and it may be no more than an assumption, in the advocates of Koster, that this change for the better also belonged to him. On the contrary, of Guttenberg and his associates we know, that they made use of metal types, and it is probable, not only that they improved them, but originally invented them. Concerning the mere improvement we are told, that after the wooden letters were relinquished, and others, cut or engraved on metal, employed, at last the mode of casting types in matrices had been discovered.² This is attributed to Guttenberg and Fust, or to their associate Schoeffer: it is immaterial to which individual the credit of the first thought is due, if we but admit that this melioration originated from one of their society, and was put in practice by them jointly. Of the wooden types they seem to have made little use,³ as if they had not perfectly learnt the manipulation of them, which it is not natural to suppose, if they be considered as the inventors. For the inventor, whoever he was, would gradually become familiar with what he had contrived, and arrive, by a slow progress, at some dexterity in the use of it: which would not be the case with another person, to whom the invention was at once imparted, and who, instead of patiently applying it, would probably be inaccurate in the use, and endeavour to make improvements for the purpose of facilitating the intended operations. Accordingly, we find that Laurens Koster seems to have plodded on with his wooden types, while Guttenberg and Fust could not make much use of them.

The story told of Laurens Koster's invention is very natural, and consistent, and carries with it a considerable degree of probability. It is said that he carved some letters in sticks of beech-wood in order to teach, by these figures, his grandchildren the alphabet. This was by no means an unusual mode of instructing

¹ See *Mnemosyne*, p. 131.

² See *Lichtenberger's Initia Typographica*, p. 99—101.

³ *Ibid.* p. 101.

children; it was even practised by the Romans, as we learn from Quintilian,¹ and it is not unknown in our nurseries. To make impressions, with letters so carved, upon paper, by means of some liquid, after this to join several of them together, and to print words, are gradations which may very well be conceived as having ultimately led to the origin of printing books. Of itself perhaps this obvious and natural progress from one step to another does not furnish a decisive proof, that the man, to whom tradition assigns this invention, is in truth entitled to that honor; but when we compare this relation, concerning Koster, with what is told of Guttenberg and those, who were joined in his labors, a far greater degree of probability attaches itself to the former than to the latter.

That appears by no means an unreasonable mode of proceeding, which the editors of *Mnemosyne*² have adopted as an accommodation between the claimants, that the probability is, that Laurens Koster was the original inventor of moveable wooden types, and that with these he printed the first books: but that Guttenberg, and the early printers of Mentz, improved upon his invention, by discovering a method of casting types in metal, and thus producing books, the superiority of which over every antecedent attempt of printing raised them to such distinction, that their merit eclipsed the fame of the first inventor. With this the history,³ that a servant, or workman, of Laurens Koster, purloined some of the printing apparatus of his master, and conveyed it to Mentz, where, by this means, he divulged, or at least converted to his use, or to that of other individuals, the secret of the art, may be well combined. We have only to suppose, that Guttenberg was the person to whom Koster's man imparted the secret, and the reputation of the invention, supported by the improvements which Guttenberg made in the types, is easily explained. It is difficult to resist the arguments in favor of Koster, nor is it less so to establish clearly the pretensions of Guttenberg. By the supposition just made, the claims of both seem to be fairly or equitably adjusted. If this be admitted, there is no question that the honor of the first invention belongs to Laurens Koster, and consequently to the city of Haarlem.

It is true, that these points are not absolutely supported by demonstrative or legal proofs, but where such are not to be had,

¹ Inst. Orat. i. 1. Those letters were sometimes carved of ivory, as Quintilian says: "Non excludo autem, id quod est notum, irritandæ ad discendum infantis gratiâ, eburneas etiam literarum formas in lusu offerre." They were also made of wood, and nominally of box. See *Nouveau Traité de Diplomatie*, tome 1. p. 543. Cicero (*de Nat. D.* ii. 37.) mentions something like metal types, "*formæ literarum vel aureæ, vel quales libet.*"

² See p. 130—133. 146.

³ Ibid. p. 135, 136.

circumstantial evidence and grounds of probability cannot be refused, in order to form an opinion. On arguments of this kind it is concluded, that printing was practised at Haarlem between the years 1420 and 1430,¹ several years prior to the period assigned to the first operations at Mentz. For these are not pretended to be earlier than the years 1450, 1440, or at most 1436. It is easily conceived that Guttenberg, Faust and Schoeffer, who had profited by the perfidy of Koster's servant, had more than one motive of interest to conceal the theft. Not only the honor of the invention might be an object of ambition to them, but still more the advantages to be gained from the exercise of the art, if they could appropriate it to their own advantage. Whatever their advocates may say to render the story of elopement of Koster's servant with the printing implements improbable, it cannot be easily confuted. There was a report of such an occurrence not only in Holland but also in Germany, which the adherents of Guttenberg have not succeeded in silencing.² It would have been easy to refute it by a simple statement of the manner in which Guttenberg had arrived at the first invention, if it had clearly been due to him; but the want of such an account, on the part of the printers at Mentz, adds to the credibility of the Haarlem tradition.

The objections which are brought forward are not calculated to invalidate it;³ 1. That it is impossible that one man could have carried away in his wallet all the printing apparatus of Koster, which must have required a cart to convey it; and 2. That it is not to be believed, that such a thief should have been suffered to depart unmolested, without an attempt to overtake and stop him. The answer to these objections is obvious. For the purpose which the thief must have had in view, it was not necessary to encumber himself with all the mass of articles which the printing-office contained. A sample of the types, and of the implements that were used, would be sufficient. And as to the other point, that he was suffered to depart quietly with his spoils, this is barely assumed. We do not know that Koster did not adopt measures to pursue him, and recover his property, though these particulars

¹ *Mnemosyne*, p. 147, 151. I find it noted in one of my Journals, that when I was at Paris, Sept. 22, 1802, M. Caperonnier, then Chief Librarian of the National Library, showed me a wooden plate with fixed letters, from which, he said, they printed at Haarlem, before the year 1430, and he exhibited some specimens of such printing. M. Caperonnier would not allow the natives of Haarlem the credit of having invented that art, but was of opinion that they had it from Guttenberg, through the perfidy of some of his journeymen. This latter part of his observation seems to be a misconception of the Haarlem story.

² See *Mnemosyne*, p. 167, 169. and Meerman, quoted therein note 43.

³ See *Mnemosyne*, p. 162.

are not related. It may perhaps be inferred from the change of place, which is mentioned as having occurred in the residence of that individual: for the tradition says,¹ that he first went to Amsterdam, then to Cologne, and lastly to Mentz, as if he had not thought himself secure in the two former towns. What deserves to be attended to in this story, and gives it a great appearance of truth, is the detail with which it is narrated. The name of the faithless journeyman is given—John; the time, when the theft was committed, is precisely noticed—Christmas-eve; the course of his flight is pointed out—Amsterdam, Cologne, Antwerp; and when he is settled at Mentz, the books which he first printed are named.² The art of printing was not exercised at Mentz before the year 1440, or, at the earliest, before 1436. But it was early practised in the Netherlands,³ and this would be best accounted for by supposing that it was a native invention. For if it had been imported from another country, some space would have been necessary to make it so generally known. It is farther remarked, that some natives of Haarlem settled, about the middle, or towards the end of the 15th century, in Italy, which renders it probable that the art they exercised abroad, existed in their own country. There is also a presumption that the art was, between the years 1454 and 1459, carried from Haarlem over to England.⁴ It is certain, that the heirs of Laurens Koster were engaged in the business of printing,⁵ a circumstance which operates likewise in favor of the opinion, that their ancestor was the inventor of the art. It is not injudiciously observed,⁶ that those who bear testimony in favor of Mentz, and of Guttenberg, though they say that printing was invented at that place, and by that person, do not distinctly speak of the invention of the moveable wooden types; it seems probable, on the contrary, that the first printers at Mentz did not make use of them. Yet it is not to be denied, that these types preceded those of metal, as they were themselves preceded by wooden plates. And if there is ground to attribute the invention of moveable wooden letters to Laurens Koster, a ground sufficiently furnished by what has been stated in the foregoing pages, we cannot otherwise than declare Laurens Koster to be the original inventor of the art of printing, though we may be induced to decree a considerable share of honor to Guttenberg, who so much improved that art, as to exhibit it in a light superior to that of its first introduction. It is alleged against Koster that, if he really had printed books, there must remain some of them as proofs of that assertion. We shall subsequently see that such specimens

¹ See *Mnemosyne*, p. 163.

² *Ibid.* 164.

³ *Ibid.* 165.

⁴ *Ibid.* 166.

⁵ *Ibid.* 166.

⁶ *Ibid.* 177.

are brought forward : but their scarcity need not be wondered at, if it be considered that what Koster printed were works of little value, some of them mere school-books, which were not likely to be preserved with much care, but would soon perish by use and by neglect. The number of copies printed of each book was probably small, so that the chance of preserving any was, from this circumstance also, more precarious.

There are some direct testimonies adduced¹ to prove Koster's invention, which must be allowed to have their weight. Among them is that of *Utricus Zell*, who, in his Chronicle of Cologne, published there in 1490, says,² that this manner of printing was *invented* at Mentz, between the years 1440 and 1450; but that the first example of it was given at Haarlem, in the editions of Donatus, and that the art was thence conveyed to Mentz, and there improved. *Zell*, it is shown by Meerman, printed at Cologne as early as the year 1467; and it appears that he had been a journeyman in Guttenberg's office, which gives his declaration particular weight: he would scarcely have transferred the honor of the first invention of the art from his own country to Haarlem, if the fact had not been generally admitted. Another important witness is *John Van Zuren*,³ a man of highly respectable character, and of letters, at Haarlem, who lived about 100 years after Laurens Koster; and bears testimony to the fact by us assumed, that though the art of printing was, in the highest degree, improved at Mentz, the first discovery of it belonged to Haarlem, where it was practised as a mystery; and thence carried to Mentz, where it acquired notoriety and fame. Next follows the attestation of *Dirk Volkertszoon Coornhert*,⁴ of Amsterdam, born 1522. He speaks of this subject in a dedication prefixed to his Dutch translation of 'Cicero de Officiis,' in which he mentions, on good authority, that the first rude beginnings of the art of printing were made at Haarlem; and that the art was thence, by a faithless journeyman, carried to Mentz. He says, that he had heard from aged persons in the former town, in what manner the printing was at first managed. This shows that the tradition of the invention at Haarlem was at that time considered as undisputed. He complains of the carelessness of his ancestors in neglecting to preserve the reputation of so important an invention.⁵ *Henry Laurenszoon Spreghel*,⁶ born at Amsterdam 1490, touches on the same topic, in a celebrated work called 'De Hertspreghel,' 'The Mirrour of the Heart;' as does *Luigi Guicciardini*,⁷ an Italian by birth, in his Account of the Netherlands, published at Antwerp in 1567. The latter speaks of the tradition generally prevailing respecting the invention of print-

¹ See Mnemosyne, p. 180.

⁴ Ib. 183.

⁵ Ib. 191.

² Ib. 181.

⁶ Ib. 184.

³ Ib. 182.

⁷ Ib. 184.

ing at Haarlem, and appeals also to the authority of anterior writers. *Mariangelus Accursius*,¹ a learned man in the beginning of the 16th century, and a native of Italy, had made an annotation on the first leaf of his "Donatus," saying, that "Donatus," and a book called "Confessionalia" were printed at Mentz in 1450, but that *Faust*, the printer, was preceded and guided by the "Donatus" printed in Holland. From the work of *Richard Atkyns*, published in England in 1664, "On the Invention of Printing," so much may be gleaned, that it seems to have been thought in England, at that time, that the art of printing was brought over from Haarlem.² And this notion receives a strong confirmation from the circumstance that *William Caxton*, the first printer in England, or rather the first English printer,³ passed a great portion of his life (about 30 years) in the Netherlands, in the countries of Brabant, Flanders, Holland, and Zealand;⁴ and it is very natural to conclude, that he there learnt the art which he afterwards exercised, and which was not known in his own country. Indeed his earliest productions were printed by him in the Low Countries, as far back as 1471, or even 1470;⁵ and he does not seem to have returned to England, and established his press there, much before the year 1477.⁶ The character of his printing entirely resembled that used in the Netherlands.⁷ The specimens shown as remains of Koster's press, are the following three books, which are preserved in the library of the senate at Haarlem: 1. "*Ælius Donatus de octo partibus orationis*." It is the first edition of that author.⁸ It is evidently printed with wooden characters, and was considered by some, for example by Funecius, Fabricius,⁹ and Daunou,¹⁰ as a specimen of xylography, that is, as an impression from wooden plates. But this notion Meerman¹¹ has proved to be erroneous, by demonstrating that it must have been printed with moveable types. For some of the letters, in single words, appear inverted, as *n* for *u*, and some are moved out of their place, so as to make the line uneven, which could not be the case if they had been engraved on a wooden plate, instead of being merely fastened together. Similar defects are to be observed in

¹ See *Mnemosyne*, p. 186.

² *Ib.* 187—191.

³ I make this distinction, because it is supposed that a tract entitled *Expositio sancti Jeronimi in symbolis Apostolorum*, was printed at Oxford in the year 1468, but by a foreigner. This was before the time of Caxton. See the Life of Wm. Caxton in Dibdin's *Typographical Antiquities*, vol. i. p. lxxv, the note.

⁴ Dibdin, *Ib.* p. lxxxi. ⁵ *Ib.* p. xc. ⁶ *Ib.* p. xcvi. ⁷ *Ib.* p. lxxix.

⁸ See Fabricii *Bibliotec. Lat.* vol. iii. p. 406. ed. Ernesti. Harles. *Notitia Lit. atque Romanæ*, p. 578.

⁹ See Harles. *Not. Lit. Rom.* p. 578.

¹⁰ See *Mnemos.* p. 196.

¹¹ In *Origines Typograph.* vol. i. p. 130.

the second Haarlem edition, which is printed somewhat smaller than the former.¹ These observations apply equally to the two following books, viz. 2. "Horarium;"² and 3. A Dutch Version of a monkish tract, entitled "Speculum Salvationis."³ All these works show a very imperfect state of printing, when the art was still in its infancy. They are by tradition attributed to Koster; but they neither bear a date, nor are marked with the name of the printer. On this circumstance Lichtenberger, and those who support the same opinion, lay great stress. It is true that the demonstrative proof which would be afforded by the signature of the printer's name and the date, if it existed, is wanting; but it will be asked, if those prints are not Koster's, to whom they belong? Can any thing better be substituted in the room of that assertion, supported by better evidence? It is not to be denied, from a view of those specimens, that they must be regarded as among the earliest attempts made in the art. Lichtenberger says,⁴ "Impressionis defectus hoc in opusculo (he is speaking of the 'Horarium,') produnt quidem typographum minus peritum, haud tamen evincunt, illud a Laurentio Harlemensi esse impressum:" "the defects in the printing, which are perceivable in this work, betray indeed an unskilful printer, but do not prove that it was printed by Laurens of Haarlem." This is true, the direct proof for Koster is wanting; but if he was not the man, who was it? It could not be Guttenberg, for his advocates would disdain to attribute such imperfect work to him; nor has any one attempted it. Much less can it be supposed that those books were executed at a period subsequent to the time of Guttenberg, Faust and Schoeffer, when these persons had given examples of superior printing. We are then left to conclude, that they must have been prior to that time; and this is the very point which was to be established. If those specimens are to be considered as being of an earlier date than the press of Guttenberg, to whom can they be assigned on more reasonable grounds than to the man whom tradition has pointed out? He is the sole person named; no other competitor is even hinted at prior to Guttenberg. The omission itself is not to be wondered at, but is rather a collateral argument. Other printers of the early period were guilty of it. There are several books of Caxton's which are without his name and date,⁵ but are, for this reason, not the less thought to be his work; and there is

¹ See *Mnemosyne*, p. 196.

² *Ib.* p. 197.

³ Lichtenberger in *Initia Typographica*, p. 116. fol. gives an account of it. See also *Mnemosyne*, p. 198.

⁴ *Init. Typograph.* p. 135.

⁵ See the *Life of William Caxton* in Dibdin's *Typographical Antiquities*, vol. i. p. cxxxv.

no book whatever extant with the name of Guttenberg subscribed,¹ yet no one has ever doubted that he was a printer.

It appears, on the whole, that the pretensions of Laurens Koster, of Haarlem, to the honor of being the first inventor of the art of printing are well founded: this is the result of the foregoing disquisition. I will, in conclusion, advert to some farther arguments, by which that opinion seems to be still more confirmed. The most recent opponent that I know of is Lichtenberger, whose work² has been quoted in the foregoing pages, and his arguments introduced. One of his objections is, that the invention of printing by Laurens Koster is not mentioned in the *Annals of Belgium*:³ not one of the chroniclers of that time, and of that country, has taken notice of it. Surely, he thinks, such an important fact could not have been passed over in silence, had it really existed. This is a fallacious, nay, an absurd argument. How many facts and occurrences must be annihilated, if their existence depends on their commemoration in certain books or records. There are so many causes of omission, that nothing would be more unsafe than to draw conclusions from the silence of contemporaries. As a man is not expected to relate every event, so a writer is not to be presumed to record what this person or that person may think deserving of attention. Such subjects as the one in question may well be passed over by those who make it their business to write on facts of a political and general nature. Who would expect, in a history of England, that any particular invention or discovery, though in itself great and useful, should be mentioned? The history may be faithful and accurate, and the fact may have occurred, yet the latter may not have been entered on record. Such circumstances are purely accidental. But let it be considered what was Koster's invention when it first was made. Could any person then, or for some time after, have imagined to what important consequences it would lead? Hardly any historian would have thought it, even in its improved state under Guttenberg, a matter of public concern, which came within his province to be related. In short, the whole objection appears to be futile.

Another argument which Lichtenberger uses, may be, with advantage, turned against himself. He states,⁴ with a sort of triumph, the inconsistency of Meerman, one of the most efficient defenders of Koster's claim. This man, in one part of his life, did not give any credit to the Haarlem invention, but regarded the whole story as a fable. For, in a letter to Wagenaar, in the year 1757, he writes: "*Quæ de inventa per Laurentium Kosterum*

¹ Dibdin, p. lxxxviii, note.

² *Initia Typographica*. Argentorati, 1811. 4to.

³ See p. 123, and full. also pp. 127, 129.

typographia venditantur, in dies magis magisque fidem amittunt; quæcunque ea de re narrat Seitzius, quæque ex historia patria pro eodem Laurentio petuntur, gratis supposita sunt; inventionum Kosteri chronologia fabulosum est commentum," &c. But the same person, eight years after, when he publishes a history of Typography ("Origines Typographicæ, Hagæ Comitum, &c. 1765,") stands forward as a zealous and ardent assertor of Koster's claims. How is this problem to be solved? Very readily, though not in the manner which Lichtenberger would suggest, as if such contradiction involved the destruction of the fact before us. In the year 1757 Meerman did not believe the story; but it seems, that when he had turned his thoughts to the publication of the work alluded to, and bestowed pains and attention on the examination of the subjects of which he was to treat, when he had investigated them with more diligence and accuracy, he relinquished his former opinion, and did homage to what appeared to him to be the truth. Such a conviction, from such a man, speaks most strongly in favor of the question, and, instead of producing a negative argument, affords the most decided affirmative. It is puerile to say, as Lichtenberger does, that Meerman had acted so, *patriæ ut placeret suæ*. It was an honest conversion from one opinion to another, or rather from prejudice to rational persuasion.

NOEHDEN.

PARALLEL PASSAGES.

WE have lately received from the Rev. J. Seager, of Welch Bicknor, the following Parallel Passages, in addition to those which have already appeared in a former Number.

SENÆCA. Epist. 95. (p. 602. l. 5. ed. Lipsii fol.) Homicidia compescimus et singulas cædes. Quid bella et occisarum gentium gloriosum scelus!

YOUNG. One to destroy is murder by the law,
And gibbets keep the lifted hand in awe:
To murder thousands takes a specious name;
War's glorious art; and gives immortal fame.

Love of Fame. Sat. 7.

BISHOP PORTEUS. — one murder makes a villain,
Millions a hero: kings are privileg'd
To kill; and numbers sanctify the crime.

Essay on Death.

OVID. Quid magis est saxo durum? quid mollius unda?
Dura tamen molli saxa cavantur aqua:

De arte amandi. I. 475.

CHRYSOSTOM. Πέτραν γὰρ κοιλαίνει, φησί, ῥανὶς ὑδάτων ἐνδε-
λεχοῦσα. καίτοι τί μιλακώτερον ὕδατος, τί δὲ πέτρας σκληρότερον ;

Hom. 46. tom. v. p. 305. l. 9. of Sir Henry Saville's edit.

VIRGIL. Uritur infelix Dido ; totaque vagatur

Urbe furens : qualis coniecta cerva sagitta,

Quam procul incautam nemora inter Cressia fixit

Pastor agens telis, liquitque volatile ferrum

Nescius : illa fuga sylvas saltusque peragrat

Dictæos : hæret lateri letalis arundo.

Æn. IV. 69.

CHRYSOSTOM. ἡ μὲν γὰρ τὸ τραῦμα ἐχθεῖσα, ἀπεπήδησε πολ-
λάκις· τὸ δὲ τραῦμα οὐκ ἀποπηδᾷ, ἀλλὰ μένει πολλάκις καὶ ἀπόλλυσι.
καὶ καθάπερ ἔλαφος δεξαμένη βέλος ἐν καιρίῳ τοῦ σώματος, κἂν ἐκφύγῃ
τῶν θηρατῶν τὰς χεῖρας, οὐδὲν κερδαίνει λοιπόν· οὕτω καὶ ψυχὴ δεξα-
μένη βέλος ἐπιθυμίας ἐξ ἀκολάστου καὶ περιέργου θεωρίας, κἂν τὸ βέλος
ἀφείσῃ (quæ telum coniecit) ἀπέλθῃ, αὐτὴ διαφθείρεται καὶ ἀπόλλυται.

Homil. 23. tom. V. p. 143. l. 7.

LUCRETIVS. Suave mari magno turbantibus æquora ventis,

E terra magnum alterius spectare laborem, &c.

CHRYSOSTOM. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἂν τις εἰς ἄκρον σκόπελον ἀνελθὼν,
θεωρῇ τὴν θάλατταν καὶ τοὺς ταύτην πλέοντας, τοὺς μὲν ὑπὸ κυμάτων
βαπτισομένους, τοὺς δὲ ὑφάλοις προσαράσσοντας, ἄλλους δὲ ἐτέρωθι
μὲν σπεύδοντας, ἐτέρωθι δὲ ἀγομένους, ὥσπερ δεσμίους, τῇ τοῦ πνεύ-
ματος ῥύμῃ, καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν ὑποῤῃρχίους γινομένους, πολλοὺς δὲ ἐπὶ
σανίδος μιᾶς, ἥ ἐπὶ τινος τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ πλοίου, φερομένους, καὶ τοὺς
μὲν ἀντὶ πλοίου καὶ πηδαλίου ταῖς χερσὶ χρωμένους μόναις, ἄλλους δὲ
νεκροὺς ἐπιπλέοντας, πολυειδῇ τινὶ καὶ πολυπρόσωπον συμφοράν·
οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὁ Χριστῷ στρατευόμενος, τῆςαραχῆς τοῦ βίου καὶ τῶν
κυμάτων ἐαυτὸν ἐξαγαγὼν, κάθηται ἐπ' ἀσφαλεῖ καὶ ὑψηλῷ χωρίῳ.

Ad Theodorum. tom. VI. p. 59. l. 30.

CICERO. In armis, militum virtus, locorum opportunitas, auxi-
lia sociorum, classes, commectus, multum juvant : maximam vero
partem quasi suo jure Fortuna sibi vindicat ; et quicquid est pros-
pere gestum, id pæne omne ducit suum. At vero hujus gloriæ, C.
Cæsar, quam es paullo ante adeptus, socium habes neminem. totum
hoc, quantumcumque est, quod certè maximum est, totum est, in-
quam, tuum. nihil sibi ex ista laude centurio, nihil præfectus, nihil
cohors, nihil turma decerpit. quin etiam illa ipsa rerum humanarum
domina, Fortuna, in istius se societatem gloriæ non offert : tibi
cedit : tuam esse totam et propriam fatetur. numquam enim teme-
ritas cum sapientia commiscetur, nec ad consilium casus admittitur.

Pro M. Marcello. II.

CHRYSOSTOM. οὐχ οὕτω τὸ κρατῆσαι πολεμίων λαμπροὺς ποιεῖ
τοὺς βυσιλευοντας, ὥς τὸ κρατῆσαι θυμοῦ καὶ ὀργῆς· ἐκεῖ μὲν γὰρ τῶν
ὅπλων καὶ τῶν στρατιωτῶν τὸ κατόρθωμα γίνεται, ἐνταῦθα δὲ γυμνὸν
σὸν ἐστι τὸ τρύπαιον· καὶ οὐδένα ἔχεις τὸν μεριζόμενον μετὰ σοῦ τὴν
τῆς φιλοσοφίας δόξαν.

Ἀνδριαντων 6. tom. vi. p. 504. l. 9.

WALLER. In battles won Fortune a part doth claim,
And soldiers have their portion in the fame, &c.

Of the Turk's defeat.

SENECA. Navis, quæ in flumine magna est, in mari parvula est.—Tu nunc in provincia, licet contempnas ipse te, magnus es.
Epist. 43.

KING JAMES I. used to tell the country gentlemen at his court, that on their estates they were like ships in a river, things of great magnitude; whereas in London they resembled ships in the sea, where in appearance they are diminished almost to nothing.

DIODORUS SICULUS. ἐκεῖνοι μὲν γὰρ τὸν ὈΦΕΙΑΜΟΝΟΝ ΤΗ ΦΥΣΕΙ θάνατον εἰς πατρίδος σωτηρίαν ἀναλώσαντες, ἀθάνατον ἑαυτῶν δόξαν καταλελοίπασιν. XIII. p. 341. ed. H. Steph.

CICERO. Non est viri, minimeque Romani, dubitare, eum Spiritum, quem NATURÆ quis DEBEAT, patriæ reddere.

Philipp. X. 20.

POPE. The life which others pay, let us bestow;
And give to fame what we TO NATURE OWE.

Transl. of Iliad, XII.

HORACE. Propriæ telluris herum natura neque illum,
Nec me, nec quemquam statuit: nos expulit ille;
Illum aut nequities, aut vafri inscitia juris,
Postremo expellet certe vivacior hæres.
Nunc ager Umbreni sub nomine, nuper Ofelli
Dictus erat, nulli proprius; sed cedit in usum
Nunc mihi, nunc alii. Serm. II. 2. 129.

LUCIAN. οὐδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτοῦ εἶναι (ἀγρόν) διωμολόγει. ταῦτ', οἶμαι, διεληφώς, ὅτι τούτων μὲν φύσει οὐδενός ἐσμεν κύριοι, νόμῳ δὲ καὶ διαδοχῇ τὴν χρῆσιν αὐτῶν εἰς ἄριστον παραλαμβάνοντες, ὀλιγοχρόνιοι δεσπότες νομιζόμεθι· κἀπεὶ δ' ἂν ἡ προθεσμία παρέλθῃ, τῆνικαῦτα παραλαβὼν ἄλλος ἀπολαύει τοῦ ὀνόματος.

In Nigirino, p. 39. B. ed. Salmur.

LUCRETIVS. Turpis enim Fama, et Contemptus, et acris Egestas,
Semota ab dulci vita squalisque videntur;
Et quasi jam LETI PORTAS CUNCTARIER ANTE.

III. 65.

VIRGIL. Vestibulum ante ipsum, primisque in faucibus Orci,
&c. &c. Æn. VI. 273.

LUCRETIVS. Inque brevi spatio mutantur sæcla animantium;
Et, quasi cursores, VITAE LAMPADA tradunt. II. 77.

DIO CASSIUS. Τὸ θνητὸν τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν αἰδίῳ διαδοχῇ γενῶν, ΟΣΗΕΡ ΤΙΝΩΝ ΛΑΜΠΑΔΙΩΝ, παραμυθεῖσθαι.

LVI. p. 578. ed. Leuncl.

Compare LUCRETIVS, book III. from v. 883 to 943, with LUCIAN, De Luctu.

HERODOTUS. βασιλῆος χεῖρ ὑπερμήκης.

OVID. An nescis longas regibus esse manus?

"And the Lord said unto Moses, Is the Lord's hand waxed short? thou shalt see now whether my word shall come to pass unto thee or not."

Numbers, XI. 23.

THUCYDIDES. Διαφερόντως γὰρ διὴ καὶ τότε ἔχομεν, ὥστε τολμᾶν τοὶ αὐτοὶ μάλιστα, καὶ περὶ ὧν ἐπιχειρήσομεν ἐκλογίζεσθαι. II. 40.

SALLUST. Ac sane, quod difficillimum in primis est, et proelio strenuus erat, et bonus consilio.

Bell. Jug.

SHAKESPEARE. —'tis much he dares:

And to that dauntless temper of his mind,
He hath a wisdom, that doth guide his valor

To act in safety.

Macbeth.

ÆSCHINES. ὥς οὖν ἐπὶ τῆς Δράκοντος ἢ Κλεισθέωνος πολιτείας οὐδὲν περὶ σέ κακὸν ἦν, (ἀρχὴν γὰρ οὐκ ἦς, περὶ ὧν ἂν ἦν) οὕτως οὐδὲ μετὰ τὴν τελευταίην γενήσεται· σὺ γὰρ οὐκ ἔσῃ, περὶ ὧν ἔσται.

Dialog. 3. De Morte.

LUCRETIVUS, lib. III. v. 842—854.

CICERO. Si post mortem miseri futuri sumus, miseri fuimus antequam nati.

Tuscul. Disp. I. c. 6.

ÆSCHINES. ἡμεῖς μὲν γὰρ ἐσμέν ψυχῇ, ζῶον ἀθάνατον ἐν θνητῷ κατειργμένον φρουρίῳ.

Dial. 3. De Morte.

VIRGIL. —neque auras

Respiciunt, clausæ tenebris et carcere cæco.

Æn. VI. 734.

ÆSCHINES. ἀλλ' ἡ γεωργία γλυκύ· δηλον. ἀλλ' οὐχ ὄλον, ὥς φασιν, ἔλκος, αἰεὶ λύπης πρόφασιν εὐρισκόμενον, κλαῖον νυνὶ μὲν αἰχμὸν, νυνὶ δὲ ἐπομβρίας, νυνὶ δὲ ἐπίκαυσιν, νυνὶ δὲ ἐρυσίβην, νυνὶ δὲ θάλπος ἀκαιρον ἢ κρύος;

Dial. 3. De Morte.

HORACE. —nunc aquas Culpante, nunc torrentia agros
Sidera, nunc hyemes iniquas.

Od. III. 1. 30.

ADVERSARIA LITERARIA.

No. XXIII.

JOANNIS BAPT. BOLLA IAMBI

IN PANTOMIMAM VIGANΘ.

Ἴδε μιμική, ὄρχησιν ἐπὶ θυμέλῃς, ἴδε
Πρῶτον παλαιᾶς Ἑλλάδος τοῦτ' ἄξιον
Καίπερ τοσούτων παῦρα θησαυρῶν ἄπο.
Ἄτω δ' ἄρ' αὐλοῦ τ' ἦχον Ἀρκαδικοῦ γλυκύν,
Καὶ Οὐιγανῶ παρέστ', ἄγει δ' αὐτὴν Ἑρως,
Δείξουσα πῶς τέχνην φύσις νικᾷν θέλει
Ἥμισυ μὲν Ἀφρογένεια, χ' ἥμισυ Δρυάς.
Ὡς ὄρχηστρίς ἔρατ', ὧς ὄρχήσεως Ἑλληνικῆς

Ψυχὰς μαλάττει ἤτε, καὶ θέλγει νόον·
 Ποῖον βάδισμα δ' ὦ πόδ' οὐ θίγοντι γῆν,
 Τὴν καρδίαν πατοῦντε δ' ὦ ὕγρον δέμας,
 Διὰ λευκὸν ἴδμεν γάρ σε φάρος τὸ χαρίεν,
 Πᾶν ἀπαλότης, πᾶν ἡδυνή· καὶ ἦν ῥόδοις
 Κόμη μέλαινά γ', ἣν ἔβαψάν τε Χάριτες.
 Τίς δ' ὄμμα, τίς γράψει πρόσωπον αὐτ' ὄλον,
 "Ενθ' ἠθικῆς κρᾶτος ἐσθ' ὄραν μιμήσεως ;
 "Εν βλέμμα πάντων κρείσσον ἦν πηδημάτων
 Φεύγει, διώκει τ', ἡδ' ἔρᾳ καύθις τρέμει,
 "Επεταί τε κ' ἐλπίζει. ἔτ' ἐρύκει δὴ φόβος.
 Χ' ἡμεῖς τρέμομεν, ἐλεῦόμεν, ἅμα συγχαίρομεν·
 Τέρπουσα παίζει, νῦν δὲ δινεῖ τ' εὐκόλως,
 Καὶ δάκτυλοι λαλοῦσι, χεῖρ τε πάθη λέγει.
 Πᾶν σχῆμα δὴ καλὸν, νόμῳ θ' Ἑλληνικῷ·
 Εὖ ἢ μὲν Ὀρας, εὖ δ' ἂν ὄρχοιτο Δαναήν·
 Τὴν δ' Ἑλλὰς ἀποδέχοιτο, καυτὴ δ' Ἑλλάδα.
 Φίλον θέαμα τοῦτο τοῖς αἰσθανομένοις.

*Important Additions to the First Alcibiades, and Timæus
 of Plato.*

THAT the editors of Plato should not have availed themselves of the sources, whence important additions to his text may be derived, and particularly when those sources in the present state of literature may be easily obtained, is not only a negligence highly blameable, but wholly unpardonable. And that they have been thus negligent, the following instances demonstrate.

In the first Alcibiades of Plato, then, towards the end, (p. 99. of Etwall's edition,) and after the words ΣΩΚ. Το δε γινωσκειν αυτον, ομολογουμεν σωφροσυνην ειvai. ΑΛΚ. Πανυ γε, the following very beautiful passage occurs in Stobæus, Serm. xxi. p. 183. *Ἀρ' ὡσπερ κατοπτρα σαφεστερα εστι του εν τῷ οφθαλμῷ ενοπτρου, και καθαρωτερα τε και λαμπροτερα, ουτω και ο θεος του εν τη ημετερα ψυχῇ βελτιστου, καθαρωτερον τε, και λαμπροτερον τυγχανειων ; Εοικε γε ο Σωκρατης. Εἰς τον θεον αρα βλεπωμετες, εκεινω καλλιστω ενοπτρῳ χρωμεθ' αν, και των ανθρωπινων εις την ψυχης αρετην, και ουτως αν μαλιστα ορωμεν και γινωσκοιμεν ημας αυτους. Ναι. i. e. " Soc. Shall we not say, therefore, that as mirrors are clearer, purer, and more splendid than that which is analogous to a mirror in the eye, in like manner God is purer, and more splendid than that which is best in our soul? Alc. It is likely, Socrates. Soc. Looking therefore at God, we should make use of him as the*

* The edition here quoted is that of 1609, fol. which is the best.

most beautiful mirror, and among human concerns, we should look at the virtue of the soul; and thus by so doing, we shall especially see and know our very selves. Alc. We shall." This passage is omitted in all the editions of Plato that I have seen, not even excepting the Bipont edition. It appears also to have been wanting in the Medicean manuscript, from which Ficinus made his translation of Plato.

In the next place, the following omissions in the *Timæus* of Plato have been unnoticed by all the editors, in consequence of not having compared the manuscript and printed copies of that dialogue with the text in the Commentaries of Proclus.

After the words, then, *κατα δὴ τὴν βατερου φoραν πλαγίαν οὐσαν, δια τῆς ταύτου φύσεως ἰοῦσαν τε καὶ κρατοῦμεν, τὸ μὲν μείζονα αὐτῶν, τὸ δὲ ἐλαττω κυκλὸν ἰόν' θάττον μὲν, τὰ τὸν ἐλαττω, τὰ δὲ τὸν μείζονα βραδύτερον περιῖοντα*, (see vol. ix. p. 320. of the Bipont edition,) the following passage occurs in the Commentaries of Proclus p. 261. *Κινεῖται τὰ ἑπτὰ σώματα, τὰ μὲν βραδύτερα ὄντα, τὰ δὲ θάττω. τὰ μὲν, ἐλαττω περιῖοντα κυκλὸν, βατερον (lege θάττον) περιεῖσιν· ὁ δὲ χρόνος μείζω περιῶν βραδύτερον.* On these words Proclus comments as genuine, in his usual admirable manner. They are also unnoticed by Ficinus, though he appears to have frequently consulted the Commentaries of Proclus; and of course, he did not find them in his manuscript.

And in the third place, in the following passage, (p. 328. of the Bipont edition,) *Ἀλλὰ τῶν τε οὐ προτερον πόνων ληξεί, πρὶν τῆς ταύτου καὶ ὁμοίου περιόδῳ τῇ ἐν αὐτῷ συνεπισπώμενος, τὸν πολὺν ὄχλον, καὶ ὑστερον προσφύντα ἐκ πυρός καὶ ὕδατος καὶ ἀέρος καὶ γῆς, ἰορυβῶδη καὶ ἀλογον ὄντα λόγῳ κρατήσας, εἰς τὸ τῆς πρώτης καὶ ἀρίστης ἀφικοῖτο εἶδος ἐξέως*, it appears from the Commentaries of Proclus, that there is an omission after *τὸν πολὺν ὄχλον*, of the word *ἐξῶθεν*. For Proclus observes, that *Timæus* *διὰ τοῦ προσφύντα φαναι, καὶ τοὺς κατα πάντα τοὺς βίους ἐξαΐει τὸ ἀλογον τοῦτο τῆς ψυχῆς, διέστησεν αὐτὸ τοῦδε τοῦ σώματος, καὶ τῆς ἰδίας τοῦτο ζωῆς. διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἐξῶθεν, καὶ τοῦ ὑστερον αὐτὸ προσθῆναι, τοῦ συμφυοῦς ὀχηματος, ἐν ᾧ κατίουσιν αὐτὴν ἐποίησεν ὁ δημιουργός.* T. TAYLOR.

AD VENERANDUM VIRUM, RICARDUM BUSBY.

Ficta sunt proxima veris.

Insanire licet, sed cum ratione, Poetis;
Et, si cum venia spires mendacia, Vates,
Si novit nullos fœcunda licentia frænos,
Sic fingis, certis et sic incerta remisses,
Ut mire lateat ficta sub imagine verum.

E cœno varias hominum finxisse figuras,

Et luteos artus animasse Promethea narras ;
 Nec non et tygres cithara traxisse sequentes
 Orphea ; nempe rudes animi incultosque Prometheus
 Instruxit, victuque fero deterruit Orpheus.

Progeniem terræ prosterunt fulminis ictus,
 Spirat inexhaustum Siculis sub montibus ignem
 Enceladus, vastusque immani mole Typhæus.
 Ili contentores superum, sævaque frementes
 Seditione monent, nequis rescindere justum
 Regibus imperium conatu tentet inani.

Narcissus, liquidis ut formam spectat in undis,
 Se fertur stupuisse, suique cupidine captus
 Interiit miser. Hæc ridetur fabula ? quot jam
 Narcissos omnis latæ dabit angulus ubis,
 Qui sua pulchra ferunt, qui se mirantur, adorant,
 Seque putant nullis respersos corpora nævis !

Icarus et Phaethon, juvenes ingentibus ausis,
 Anni quæ teneri, quæ vires ferre recusant,
 Abstinent ; ne præcipites trahat ambitus, et ne
 In sua veloces nimium discrimina currant.

Proteus aut in avem vel se tranformat in anguem,
 Conversa fallens sensus oculosque figura ;
 Jupiter Europam petiit sub imagine tauri,
 In niveum Lædæ fallit mutatus olorem ;
 Quis non has formas effingit hypocrita ? quis non
 Nocte dieque potest alienum sumere vultum,
 Callidus et larvam culpæ obducere tentat.

Te, Danae, summo multum dilecta Tonanti,
 Ærea custodit turris, vigil atque satelles ;
 Rex superum fulvo descendens aureus imbre,
 Et faciles aditus habuit, facilesque beatæ
 Virginis amplexus : Atalantæ fervet amore
 Tardior Hippomenes, curreptique aurea poma
 Obstruit, Hippomenis victoria debita pomis ;
 Auro nil obstat, penetrat solido ære rigentes
 Hoc turres, armis teloque potentius omni ;
 Hoc rigidas mollit mentes, adversaque corda
 Conciliat, vanis præstatque cupidinis armis.

Duritiem Celus, Midas temeraria vota,
 Tu Niobe, fastus, et tu perjuræ falsæ,
 Batte, vetas linguæ. Fumoso Cacus in antro
 Herculeæ passus sævissima verbera dextræ,
 Dat monitum nequis furto lætatus inani,
 Astute speret meritis evadere pœnas.

Cui miranda subit Lyrneæ dira paludis

Bellua, quæ toties ferri secunda dolentem
Crescit in Alcidem, damnoque potentior extat.
Quisnam hominum est quem tu contentum videris uno
Flagitio? sævo crescit sub verbere crimen.

Hinc fera Tisiphone sævis armata flagellis,
Illinc squamosis serpentibus horret Erynnis,
Et torquet miseros animos vitioque gravatos.
Quis non Tisiphonen, quis non sibi præstat Erynnim,
Conscia quem premit et surdo meus verberat ictu?

Mænades et Pentheus, contempto numihe Divum,
Ut Vates perhibent, alias habuere figuras:
Illæ prægnantem dum torquent stamine fustum
Et festam stulto lucem sermone profanant;
Hic sacro dum fundit ovans opprobria Baccho;
Nimirum qui non digno veneretur honore
Numina, qui sacris faciat convivia divis,
Exiit ille viri mentem, dignusque videtur
Qui brutis socium se misceat, atque viriles
Effugiat longe cœtus; aut, quod fuit olim,
Montibus edurum saxum formetur in altis.

Ut quæ sint posthac virtutis præmia veræ
Exhibeant, oculis longe distantia nostris,
Elysios campos sacri finxere Poetæ,
Hic blandi flores Zephyris melioribus halant,
Hic etiam lucis arbor prædives opacis
Fulgentes viridi ramos curvata metallo,
Quæ spatiosam umbris præbet spatiantibus umbram.
Huc admissæ animæ Lethæa ad flumina tendunt,
Longaque præteritæ potant obliviam vitæ.
Finxerunt etiam natos melioribus annis
Heroas, gelidos cum primum spiritus artus
Deseruit, socios ipsis accumbere divis.

Vos etiam, Vates, ut quæ post funera soutes
Expectent pœnæ, discant timeantque nefandi,
Innocuum et durant vitæ sine labe tenorem,
Præbetis justas dantei Salmoneæ pœnas;
Et vastum in latos Tityon extenditis agros,
Et fœcunda nimis depascit pectora vultur.
Saxa, rotas, furias, naves sulturis ignes,
Vates, ficta licet, cecimere similima veris.

Tui favoris studiosissimus,

1694.

R. FREIND.

DE COMETA

Qui, anno 1819, ipsis improvisus Astronomis, apparuit.

CEDANT, æthereos oculis quicunque meatus,
 Atque inconcessi tentant penetralia cœli,
 Nec superam tellus sedem sibi vindicet. Olim
 Fas erat: ingenii volucres quo tempore nisus,
 Terrenamque animam vir plus quàm humanus ad altum
 Erigeret Newto, mundumque amplexus, et astra
 In rutilas cogens temerè palantia turmas,
 Exiguo magnos radio comprehenderet orbes.
 Atque utinàm, ô Newto, cœlo mens reddita rursus
 Dignaretur humum! querimur sed vana. Pusillas,
 Heu! mentes hominum nunc degener educat ætas.
 Ipsa, suis quondàm Newtonibus inclyta, quondàm
 Præscia fatorum, divinæ præscia legis,
 Ipsa quoque, inventam lustris labentibus artem,
 Gallia dedit: nec jam fugitiva requirit
 Sidera, nec certos reditus variosque labores,
 Crinigerive globi callet prædicere caudam.
 Æthereas quanquàm tentet creberrimus arces
 Uraniæ tiro, speculari lumina vitro
 Armatus, stellasque novas indagine captet,
 Uraniam nuper riserunt numina nostram,
 Et clandestinum tacitâ sub nocte cometen
 Incautis misère sophis: delusa sophorum
 Erubuit virtus; veterum sic provida sensim
 Degenerat, retròque ruit prudentia patrum.
 Tempus erat, quo prima quies subrepat in urbem,
 Atque Parisiacos involvit languida muros;
 Tardus in obliquum plaustra inclinare Bootes
 Cœperat, et pleno Phœbi soror æmula cornu
 Luna micans, tremulas radios fundebat in undas.
 Jam noctis decimam summis è turribus horam
 Ænea vocali ferro campana per auras
 Tinnierat; clausæ ferro valvisque tabernæ,
 Atque catenarum solidâ compage silebant.
 Amplexus trepidis mortalia Morpheus alis
 Corpora, securâ mulcebat pace; nec unus
 Astronomos inter stabat vigil, ardua cœli
 Qui peteret, vitreisque tubis circumdatus, orbes
 Acrios oculis, procul explorator obiret.

Tanta viris secura suâ fiducia ! tantum
Astronomis robur cœli queis sidera parent !

Ecce autem toto prostant dùm pectore rhonchos,
Et lenti recubant stratis in mollibus, ingens
Exoritur clamor, varisque è partibus urbis,
Per Luxemburgi tranquilla palatia repens,
Nocturnasque inter tiliâs grassatur ad ædes,
Magnus ubi Lodoix præclaris artibus, olim
Perfugium sublime, polo vicina locavit
Atria; divinas ubi Gallica prospicit arces
Uranie, solisque vias et sidera servat.

Nec mora, confuso misceri limina motu,
Et cæci plebis circùm mugire tumultus.

Astronomis somnum rupit pavor : ociùs artus
Lentè festinant dulci subducere lecto.

Quid plebes clamosa petit ? nùm proximus ædes
Ignis corripuit ? subito nùm Sequana fluctu
Crevit, et oppositas affectat gurgite moles ?
Nec præsentis enim, Lodoico principe, castis
Fas aliam Gallis nunc causam quærere : bella,
Horrida bella procul Deus abstulit : impia dudùm.
Tempora fugerunt, nunquàm reditura, cruentæ
Plebis ubi furia magnos ad vincla Quirites
Protraherent, strictoque manus vilissima ferro,
Funera funeribus totâ cumularet in urbe.
Undè tamen densum fervet per compita vulgus,
Atque soporiferas turbat clamoribus horas ?
Nulla quidem nimbos inter cæcosque recessus
Stella injussa latet : non præmatura cometa
Cauda, vel exiles ducens sine nomine flammæ,
Ignaris est ausa sophis fulgere : sophorum
Præsas nequeunt cœlestia fallere mentes.

Sed quæ tanta sophis abruptit causa soporem ?

Dùm dubitant hærentque viri, tardique veterno,
Et dormitantes, vestigia lenta sub umbras
Hortorum gelidas, loca somno debita, ducunt,
Dùm causas ardent scitari et quærere, cœlo
Fortè unus patulâ cœtivicem oscedine librans,
Languentes oculorum orbis inflectit, et ecce
O pudor astronomis ! ô improvisa futuri
Pectora ! certa fides ; sensus non decipit error ;
Ecce noyûm, socii, sidus ; novus orbis Olympum
Occupat : Arctous Boreas quâ rauca volutat
Murmura, suspicitis ? Rutilas crinita per auras
Stella trahit radios, stellas supereminet omnes,

Caudaque ad occiduum vergit nitidissima solem ;
Verus adest (verusque aderat sub nocte) cometes.

Exemplò tremefacta pavor per membra cucurrit
Astronomis : tollunt ad cœlum lumina, tandem
Pervigiles ; solos inter, mora nulla, recessus,
Quisque suas tacitis adrepens passibus ædes,
Quà data porta, subit, tempestivasque per umbras
Multa gemens ignominiam, communia summæ
Ascendit trepido speculæ fastigia gressu.
Hic chartas vitreosque tubos, doctasque tabellas
Expediunt, nitidique inopinos hospitis ignes
Scrutantur, signantque viam, finemque futurum
Conjiciunt, magicâque involvunt arte cometem.
Tunc senior, penitus cœli cui cognitus orbis,
Cui rerum major collecta scientia, fati
Ora movens, placido medius sic pectore cœpit :
“ O socii, tenuem queis invidere triumphum
“ Numina, venturum quoniam prænoscere nobis
“ Haud licuit, præsens liceat nunc dicere sidus,
“ Et quæ forma globi, quid prodigiale minetur,
“ Olim flammigero non unquam crine cometes
“ (Haud ignota loquor,) terris impunè refulsit ;
“ Sæpius et mundi gentes timuere ruinam,
“ Cum piceâ pallens ferrugine cauda, tremendi
“ Sideris obscuras radiis incenderet umbras.
“ Haud nescitis enim, mediâ quo tempore Româ
“ Interiit Cæsar, micuerunt plurima cœlo
“ *Fulgura, nec diri toties arsere cometæ.*
“ Nos etiam nuper (priscis conferre recentes
“ Si casus liceat), nos Galli vidimus, ingens
“ Forma globi, lugubrè rubens, ignesque sinistros
“ Æthere diffundens apparuit : ilicet imis
“ Sedibus exclusæ venere ad prælia gentes ;
“ Sarmaticumque petens armis audacibus orbem
“ Inter inaccessos brumarum Gallia montes,
“ Imprudens gelidis jacuit tumulata sub oris.
“ Nunc autem melior Lodoico defluit ætas
“ Principe ; nunc alter seclorum panditur ordo,
“ Pacatisque favent cœlestia numina terris.
“ Non ferrugineo præsentis cauda cometæ
“ Igne micat : pallent radii, lucemque modestam
“ Ejiciunt, almoque polum splendore serenant.
“ Tolle caput, felix ô tandem Gallia ; sidus

" Ecce novum placido procedere cœpit Olympo,
 " Aurea quo plenis manabit copia rivis :
 " Regius en infans, dudùm exspectatus, amanti
 " Terræ allabetur, magnæ spes altera matris.
 " Jam roseo nostrum reclusit lumine cœlum
 " Auroræ facies, nitidi prænuntia solis,
 " Sol etiam, divina suos modò numina curent,
 " Sol etiam totum radiis complebit Olympum.
 " Exoriare, puer ; tellus tibi lilia fundit,
 " Innexâque parat cunabula myrtea lauro.
 " Ipse suos crebro præcingit palmite colles
 " Pampineus Liber, multoque exercita vino
 " Dolia venturum siccatur renovanda per annum.
 " Exoriare, puer ; pretioso nectare Bacchus
 " Ipse tuos, dùm fata sinant, celebrabit honores ;
 " Nec jam (si qua fides, si conscia pectora veri)
 " Astronomos fatum non prædixisse pudebit."

Sic fatur senior : plausu fremituque secundo
 Docta cohors magni miratur verba propheta,
 Errorem solata suum. Tunc quisque tenaces
 Æthereis oculos defigere sedibus ; omnes
 Dùm lecto recubant, noctis vigilare sub umbrâ,
 Terque quaterque poli longos ambire meatus ;
 Nec mora, nec requies : durum nunc ferre laborem
 Astronomi, somnosque volunt pro laude pacisci :
 Scilicet egregium certè deprendere sidus
 Quo præeunte puer nascetur regius, alta
 Borbonidùm proles, optanti debita mundo.
 Atque utinàm non sera canam, felixque Garumna
 Burdigalâ puerum regnantem cernat in urbe,
 Burdigalæque Duce[m] totâ cum gente salutet !

Parisiis, 1820.

HENRIOT.

THE ORIGIN OF THE HEATHEN MYTHOLOGY.

IN every Christian age, objectors to the Bible have industriously labored to adapt the ancient compositions of the sacred volume to more modern circumstances ; and to show that "the heathens

were a just and moral people, and had much better and clearer ideas of justice and morality than are to be found in the Bible." If this could be proved, it would strike at the root of the morality, antiquity, genuineness, and authenticity of the Bible. For if it were as modern as these objectors have endeavoured to represent it, and if it could be proved that the "heathens had clearer ideas of justice and morality than are to be found in the Bible," the heathen mythology being more ancient, and the principal transactions recorded in the ancient part of the Bible agreeing with those in the mythology, it would then follow, according to the wish of these objectors, that the Bible would be founded on the fables of the heathens.

The ignorance of these men respecting the people, who, they say, had as clear ideas of justice and morality as are to be found in the Bible, is manifest; for that race of ancients, who had as perfect ideas of justice and morality as are to be found in the Bible, lived before the time of Moses, and worshipped the true God according to the dispensation which came down through all the patriarchal churches to the time of its renewal under Noah: and thus the divine order descended from him to Abraham; was established in Jacob, who became the visible head of the tribes of Israel, and of the church of God; and was again renewed under Moses. That those were the men who had "as clear ideas of justice and morality as are to be found in the Bible," is true, because the record of their justice and morality is to be found in the Bible.

But the heathens, or the *גוים*, *göim*, which should be rendered *nations*, so frequently mentioned in the Bible, were the idolaters of the different nations, the Deists, the "moral philosophers," the *free-thinkers*, the *theophilanthropists*, of that day—men of vanity, who took the high-sounding names of Jupiter, Bacchus, Mercury, and Hercules, adorers of reason while living, and worshipped as gods when dead:—these were the men who are called in the Bible heathens. If it appear what description of men are in the Bible said to be heathens, that every objection respecting the antiquity, authority, and genuineness of the Bible may be removed, I will say a few words concerning the mythology of the heathens; and by the testimony of the best and most ancient historical writers, sacred and profane, show that the principal things recorded in the heathen mythology, are taken from the Bible, and have, in succeeding ages, been applied to their gods or deified mortals.

The fabulous Egyptian mythology being prior to the Grecian and the Cretan, I begin with Bacchus and his father Jupiter Ammon, the first and most distinguished among men who were worshipped as gods, and who, according to the best authorities, did not live till more than 500 years after the time of Moses.

The first thing then to determine is, who this Bacchus was, and the time in which he lived. That this Egyptian Bacchus was the

same person whom Herodotus calls Sesostris,¹ will appear from what follows : Sesostris came out of Egypt with a great army, and invaded the East in the same manner, and with every circumstance as is recorded of the true Bacchus, who, on account of his conquests, was celebrated in various nations by different names. The Arabians² called him SMESHAC, and BACCHUS, which, in the Arabic language, signifies *great* ; the Chaldeans called him BELUS, which is LORD ; the Phrygians and Thracians called him MARS, or VALIANT ; the Greeks, OSIRIS ; and the Egyptians, SESOSTRIS. The actions of this Bacchus and Sesostris are the same ; both are said to have conquered India,³ invaded Greece, and to have been routed by the army of Perseus ; both are said to have reigned at Thebes in Egypt, adorned that city, and to have been very potent by land and sea ; both came over the Hellespont, and were there in danger of losing their armies ; both are said to have conquered Thrace, and to have returned in triumph to Thebes ; both are said to be the first king of all Egypt, that is, upper and lower Egypt, including Thebais, Ethiopia, and Libya. Pliny informs us that Ethiopia served Egypt till the death of Sesostris : and *Herodotus*⁴ says that *he alone*, of all the kings of Egypt, enjoyed the empire of Ethiopia. Hence as none of the kings of Egypt subdued the empire of Ethiopia but Sesostris, and as Bacchus, king of Egypt, conquered the empire of Ethiopia, this Theban, or Egyptian Bacchus, could be no other than Sesostris, as it plainly appears that Sesostris was the ancient Egyptian Bacchus.

The next thing to determine is, who Sesostris was, and at what time he lived. Many attempts have been made to ascertain the person and time of Sesostris ; but on account of the variety of names given to this great conqueror of the eastern nations by those whom he subdued, and who spoke a different language, nothing is clear as to the person and time of this powerful Egyptian king. In order clearly to fix the time when Sesostris governed Egypt, we must refer to the ancient records of the Bible, which will prove, in conjunction with the above-mentioned historians, that Sesostris was no other than Shishak, king of Egypt, who is so repeatedly mentioned in the Scriptures. For as *none of the kings of Egypt* had dominion over Ethiopia but Sesostris, according to Herodotus, and as Ethiopia served Egypt till the death of Sesostris, according to Pliny, and other writers ; if it should appear that *Shishak, king of Egypt, had dominion over the Ethiopians*, and that after his death the Ethiopians were sufficiently powerful to invade the rest of the eastern nations, it will prove that Sesostris was Shishak, king of Egypt. In the 2d Chron. xii. 2, 3. it is said, " And it came to pass that in the fifth year of king Rehoboam, Shishak, king of Egypt, came up against Jerusalem with 1200

¹ I. ii. c. 110.² Chron. anc. King.³ Ibid.⁴ I. ii. c. 110.

chariots, and 60,000 horsemen, and the people (the foot soldiers) were without number that came with him out of Egypt, the Lubims, the Sukkims, and the Ethiopians:" viz. the nations he had conquered and incorporated with his own people.

Thus we see that the Ethiopians, who came with Shishak out of Egypt, formed a considerable part of this immense army, which is sufficient Bible evidence to prove that Shishak must at that time have had dominion over Ethiopia; otherwise such great numbers of Ethiopians would not have been united with his army in Egypt. If we compare this with what has been observed from Herodotus and Pliny, "that Sesostris only, of all the kings of Egypt, had dominion over Ethiopia," it will so far prove that Sesostris was Shishak.

We are informed, in the 2d verse, that when this powerful army entered Judea it was in the fifth year of the reign of Rehoboam; and the 13th verse says he reigned 17 years; Abijah his son 3 years: and the 14th verse states, that the land rested from war under Asa, the son of Abijah, 10 years; which will be 25 years in all from the time that Shishak invaded Judea, and which will no doubt bring us to the death of Shishak, or Sesostris, when the writers above-mentioned say that the Ethiopians threw off the Egyptian yoke. And this is evidently recorded in the same chapter; for at the end of the period of 25 years, it is said, "and there came up against them Zerah the Ethiopian, with an host of a thousand thousand;" viz. (a million) from which it appears that the account given by Herodotus and Pliny concerning Sesostris is in perfect agreement with the Bible account of Shishak, as to time, place, and circumstance. Hence as it is evident that Sesostris, or the ancient Egyptian Bacchus, was the Shishak of the Scriptures, Sesostris being the Egyptian, and Shishak the Arabian, name of that king, we can no longer be at a loss to know who this Sesostris was, and at what time he lived. For Shishak, or Sesostris, reigned in Egypt in the time of Rehoboam the son of Solomon. Hence it is clear, that the most ancient heathen Bacchus did not appear till 600 years after Moses: consequently those parts of the Heathen Mythology where we find the particular transactions and circumstances recorded of this Bacchus, which are also recorded in the Scriptures, must have been taken from thence by the compilers of the Mythology.

I have no objection to the name of Bacchus, which signifies *great*; for whoever attentively examines the theology of Bacchus as recorded in the mythology of the heathens, and compares it with the books of Moses, will conclude that the true Bacchus was Moses himself, and that the true Jupiter, the father of Bacchus, was Jehovah the father of all mankind.

That the word Jupiter, is derived from Jehovah, will appear from what follows. Diodorus Siculus says, that Moses called the

God of heaven JAO, and JEHOVAH, and the Phœnicians, who deified their kings, when first they went into Greece with Cadmus, their commander, gave the name of JAO PATER, (Jupiter,) which is JEHOVAH the FATHER, to their kings.

It is fabled in the Mythology that Bacchus dried up the rivers Orontes and Hydaspes, by striking them with his thyrsus, and passed over them : as it is said that Moses divided the Red Sea and the river Jordan with his rod, and passed through them. That an ivy stick thrown on the ground by Bacchus, crept like a dragon : as it is recorded, that the rod, cast on the ground before Pharaoh, became a serpent. That the enemies of Bacchus once were all covered with darkness, while those who were with him enjoyed perfect day : as it is written concerning the Egyptians and the Israelites. A dog was given to Bacchus as a constant companion : so Moses had his Caleb, which in Hebrew signifies a dog.¹ Pausanias relates, that the Greeks at Troy found an ark which was sacred to Bacchus : the ark was one of the most sacred symbols given by Moses.

Again, *Bacchus (in the Mythology) is said to have been born in Egypt, put in an ark, and exposed to the waters : the same is recorded of Moses.*

Bacchus is said to have had two mothers : so had Moses, his own mother, and the daughter of Pharaoh. Plutarch says, "the Egyptians affirm that Isis was brought to the queen and appointed by her to nurse the child."

Bacchus is said to be the god of wine : alluding to Moses, who sent the spies to the land of Canaan, from whence they brought grapes.

Diodorus Siculus and Strabo affirm that the sepulchre of Osiris (Bacchus) was unknown to the Egyptians, that is, to the Israelites, whom the heathen writers called Egyptians : the same is recorded in Deut. xxiv. 6. concerning Moses, "But no man knows of his sepulchre unto this day."

Bacchus's flight was toward the Red Sea : so was the flight of Moses.

One of the symbols in the theology of Bacchus was a serpent : Moses set up the brazen serpent in the wilderness.

Bacchus had great numbers of women in his army : as Moses in his journey to Canaan.

It is said wherever Bacchus went the land flowed with milk and honey : the same is recorded in the Mosaic history concerning the land of Canaan.

Moses was instructed in mount Sinai respecting the rites and sacrifices of the Jewish worship : *the same is said of Bacchus by Ovid.*

It is further said in the *Mythology*, that *Bacchus was instructed in the highest wisdom in a mount of Arabia called Nissi*: Moses resided there 40 years, and erected an altar which he called *Jehovah Nissi*. *Exod. xvii. 15.* From which it appears sufficiently evident that the true Bacchus was Moses.

The ancient heathen writers have also noticed many other things recorded in the books of Moses. Eusebius relates that his being taken out of the Nile is sung by the author of the ancient Orphic verses, which expressly mention his being taken out of the water, and the two tables that were given him by God.¹

“ So was it said of old, so he commands,
Who’s born of water, who received from God
The two great tables of the Law.”

Pharaoh’s two principal magicians,² Jannes and Jambres, and the opposition they made to Moses, are recorded in Eumenius,³ Pliny,⁴ and Apuleius. The plagues in Egypt are mentioned by Eupolemus;⁵ and the departure of the Israelites out of Egypt is related by Tacitus.⁶

Thus have these pagan writers (whom we cannot suppose to have been friends to the religion of the Bible) noticed the above, and many other particulars recorded in the books of Moses. Also the ancient lawgivers who followed Moses, in order to imitate the grand and awful display of the divine presence on mount Sinai, have pretended to receive their laws from some god or goddess; as Numa, from Egeria; Zeleucus, from Minerva; Lycurgus, from Apollo at Delphi; and Minos, from Jupiter in the Cretensian den.

Hence we see the origin of the prostitution of those sacred truths contained in the ancient part of the Bible; for when the pride and wickedness of the nations, like modern deists, had banished from the mind of man every idea of the superintending providence of *God*, of a *future state*, and of *God himself*;—then it was that they began to deify their kings and great men, and to worship their resemblance in wood and stone;—then it was that the actions of Moses, the true Bacchus, were fabled of the Theban Bacchus, the conqueror of Asia, and king of all Egypt.

That Jupiter Ammon, or the Egyptian Jupiter, was a king of Egypt, and the father of the Egyptian Bacchus, is confirmed by Diodorus Siculus,⁷ who says, that “Osiris (Bacchus or Shishak, as above) built in Thebes a magnificent temple to his father Jupiter Ammon, who reigned in that city.” And Thyametes,⁸ who lived near the time of Orpheus, wrote expressly “that the father of Bacchus was Ammon, a king of Egypt, reigning over all that part

¹ Grotius, Book i. Sec. 16. ² 2 Tim. iii. 8.

³ Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* l. i. ⁴ *Ib.* l. viii. 8. ⁵ *Ib.* ⁶ L. v.

⁷ *Diod.* l. i. 9. ⁸ *Apud Diod.* l. iii. 141.

of Libya anciently called Ammonia;" from which he was called Jupiter Ammon, king and sovereign father of that country, Now Ammon the father of Sesostris the Egyptian Bacchus reigned in the time of Solomon;" so that those parts of the Mythology where these writers introduce Jupiter Ammon, the most ancient of the heathen gods, or deified men, will not reach beyond the time of Solomon or David; consequently what is recorded in the ancient part of the Bible, as performed in the time of Moses and Joshua, wherever it occurs in the mythologic history, must have been taken from the books of Moses and Joshua.

Diodorus Siculus says, l.i. 145, that the Grecian Mythology was of a far later date than the Egyptian, which is also confirmed by the father of the Greek historians, Herodotus, l. ii. who observes that "the oracle at Dodona was the oldest in Greece, and was set up by an Egyptian woman after the example of the oracle of Jupiter Ammon at Thebes."

Jupiter Olympius, or the Cretan Jupiter, celebrated by Homer, is of a later date than Jupiter Ammon, or the Egyptian Jupiter; for the Cretan and Grecian Mythology succeeded the Egyptian and Tyrian; and it was from the mountain Olympus in Crete, that the Cretan Jupiter was styled Jupiter Olympius, who, in the 18th Iliad, declares himself to be eternal and supreme, by shaking the mountain Olympus with his imperial nod, threatening his rebellious offspring with destruction. But it will appear that this is also an imitation of the awful and tremendous descent of God on mount Sinai, when he threatened the rebellious Israelites with destruction; for this circumstance, which the heathens have applied to Jupiter Olympius, took place near 600 years before the Olympic Jupiter appeared.

The Mythology also informs us, that *Mercury was born in Egypt, was the secretary of Bacchus, and the messenger of the gods: and that with his caduceus, or rod, around which were two serpents, he could perform wonderful things.* But it will be evident, by comparing these passages with the facts recorded in the Bible, that the true Mercury was Aaron: for Aaron was born in Egypt, and was the messenger from God and Moses (the true Bacchus) to Pharaoh. The caduceus, or rod, is in perfect agreement with the rod which he cast down before Pharaoh, and which destroyed the two serpent-rods of Jannes and Jambres, the magicians who opposed him.

I shall conclude this subject with a few remarks concerning the Hercules of the heathens, and show that the great acts related of him are literally transcribed from the history of the Joshua of the Hebrews. *Hercules is said to have fought against Typhæus and the rest of the giants by command of the gods; as it is written,*

that Joshua fought by the command of God against the Canaanites, men of great stature, the sons of Anak.

That whilst *Hercules* was fighting, he was assisted by *Jupiter*, who rained down hail-stones, which destroyed great numbers of them; the same is recorded in the book of Joshua. "The Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them unto Azekab, and they died." "This oriental Hercules (says Vossius), for many ages more ancient than the Theban (or Egyptian) Hercules, was by his true name called Joshua, who made war with the Canaanites."

That the giant Typhœus was Og, the king of Bashan, appears, not only from the same author, but by other unquestionable authorities. This word in the Greek (the language in which the heathens wrote their mythology) signifies, to *kindle* or *smoke*, and has the same meaning with *אֵשׁ*, Og, to *bake* or *burn*; so that Typhœus and Og in both languages have the same meaning. That Typhœus and Og were only different names for the same person, will appear from Homer, who, speaking of Jupiter's striking down the giant Typhœus with his thunder, informs us that the chief of the giants had his bed in Aram:

Εἰν Ἀρίμοις ὅθι φασὶ Τυφώεος ἔμμεναι εὐνάς. II. B. 783.

That this Arima, where Homer says the giant's bed remained, was the same with Syria,¹ is certain. Strabo² observes, "by the Arima, they understand the Syrians, who are now called Arimi." "This name, instead of Syria, has also been continued in the English translation of the Bible down to the time of Elizabeth, where Syria is called Aram, and the Syrians Aramites. The bed of Typhœus therefore being said by Homer to be in Arima or Syria, is in perfect agreement with the account we have of the bed of Og. Deut. iii. 11. "For only Og king of Bashan remained of the remnant of the giants; behold his bedstead was a bedstead of iron, is it not in Rabbah of the children of Ammon?" which was Atram, or Syria, as above: from which it is evident that when Homer celebrated the war of the giants against the gods, though unknown to him, he recorded the transactions of the Jewish leader in the land of Canaan.

The Mythology says, that *Hercules and Bacchus made an expedition to India*; but as we know nothing concerning such an expedition by Moses and Joshua to that part of the world which we now call India, this seems to set aside all that has been said on the subject. We shall however easily remove this difficulty by proving, that the land of Canaan was anciently called India. Vossius says, "the ancients called all parts eastward of the Mediterranean sea India." This appears also from Ovid,³ who says,

¹ Strabo, l. xiii.

Syria in the original is called אֲרָם, Aram, 2 Kings, vi. 11, and the Syrians Aramites, v. 9.

² Vossius, de Idolat. l. i. c. 26.

³ Ovid. de arte Amandi.

“Perseus brought Andromeda from India;” but Perseus did not bring his wife Andromeda from modern India, but from Joppa, a town in the land of Canaan, according to Strabo.¹ Therefore it is clear that the expedition, which Hercules and Bacchus are said to have made to India, will perfectly agree with the expedition of Moses and Joshua to the land of Canaan.

The place also, where this ancient oriental Hercules is said to have fought with the giants, will perfectly agree with the account of Joshua and Og. Vossius² proves this battle to have been fought in Arabia, near mount Nissi and Serbonis, which also is clear from Apollonius: “Typhœus came thus to the mountains and Nissian field, where he lies overwhelm’d under the waters of Serbonis.” The mount Nissi in the Mythology is sacred to Bacchus, originally Moses, (as above,) who erected an altar in the Nissian mountain in Arabia, which he called Jehovah Nissi. Exod. xvii. 15. It is further said that Hercules was fellow-soldier with Bacchus, and together with him fought near the mountain Nissi against the giants, which exactly answers to Joshua and Moses against Og and the Canaanites.

It is further said in the Mythology, that “the gods with whom the giants fought came out of Egypt, and were twelve in number; that Bacchus was commander-in-chief of the whole army, but that the direction of the war was under the management of Hercules his first general.” Hence it appears that the twelve tribes are described as gods; and the war of the Hebrews with the Canaanites, as the war of the gods with the giants. Lastly, that the most ancient and true Hercules was not an Egyptian, Theban, Cretan, or Grecian Hercules, who lived in the time of Rehoboam the son of Solomon, but lived long before any of those who were worshipped as gods of the heathens, is asserted in Lucian, who says, (speaking of the Syrian goddess,) “that temple of Hercules, which is at Tyre, belongs not to the Theban Hercules,³ which the Greeks so much extol, but he that I now speak of is more ancient, called the Phœnician Hercules.” Phœnicia was a part of the land of Canaan, the theatre of the wars of Joshua; therefore as this ancient Phœnician Hercules lived before those who were worshipped as gods by the heathens, and as the above circumstances both as to time and place will apply to no one but Joshua, who was prior to them all; it follows that the true Hercules was Joshua, who lived near 500 years before the Theban Hercules, the most ancient Hercules of the heathens. Consequently those acts recorded of him, which are found in the Bible, have been taken from it by the compilers of the Mythology.

¹ Strabo, l. i.

² Voss, de Idolat. l. i. c. 26.

³ Who was the oldest Hercules of the heathens.

Having thus ascertained who the true Jupiter, Bacchus, Mercury, and Hercules were, and as these were the greatest and most powerful of the gods of the heathens, I shall quit this subject (for the lesser gods, though they be numerous, must necessarily share the fate of their leaders); and endeavour to prove by undeniable evidence that among the Phœnicians, Sanchoniathon and Mochus, who lived 200 years before the time of David; also the ancient philosophers, historians, and poets, down to the time of Plato, 400 years before Christ, had a great part of their information concerning divine subjects from the books of Moses.

That the ancient part of the Bible was the fountain from which the Egyptians, Phœnicians and Grecians drew their theology, is proved in the Chronicon of the laborious and learned Eusebius, who searched the libraries of the historians and philosophers of Phœnice, Egypt, and Greece. He has shown by the testimony of their authentic memorials that the books of Moses were prior to the origin of the most remote pagan antiquity.

It appears that the most ancient tradition among all nations is consistent with the relation of Moses,¹ for the Phœnician description of the creation of the world nearly agrees with that of the venerable penman, as it is translated by Philo Biblius from Sanchoniathon the Phœnician historian, and preserved by Eusebius.² The words of Sanchoniathon are: "The foundation of the universe was a dark air, or the breath of a dark air, and a dismal chaos covered with thick darkness; but when this spirit or breath placed its desire or love on these first principles, and a mixture was produced, this conjunction was called love. This was the beginning of the creation of all things; but the breath or spirit was not created." Numenius,³ cited by Porphyry, about the nymphs' den, affirms, it was said by the prophet, (meaning Moses,) that the spirit of God was moved upon the waters. Linus,⁴ who lived a long time before Hesiod or Homer, respecting the chaos, informs us, as he was himself taught: "In the beginning all things were confused." It is also said in the Phœnician Theology that "the earth was illuminated with light, whence came the sun and moon. Anaxagoras says, "All things were blended together till the divine mind separated them." Hesiod, who was older than Homer, almost literally follows the text of Moses: he says in his Theogonia:

Ἦτοι μὲν πρῶτιστα Χάος γένετ', αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
Γαῖ' εὐρύστερνος, πάντων ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ
Ἀθανάτων, οἱ ἔχουσι κάρη νιφοέντος Ὀλύμπου,
Τάρταρά τ' ἱερόεσσα μυχῷ χθονὸς εὐρυδείης.

¹ Grotius, book i. ² Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. i. c. 10. ³ Ib. ⁴ Ib.

Ἐκ Χάος δ' Ἐρεβὺς τε, μέλαινά τε Νύξ ἐγένοντο,
 Νυκτὸς δ' αὖτ' Αἰθήρ τε καὶ Ἡμέρη ἐξεγένοντο,
 Οὗς τέκε κυσσαμένη, Ἐρέβει Φιλότητι μιγεῖσα.

Thales, whom Herodotus and Leander assert to have been originally a Phœnician, says, "that darkness was before the light." This is also expressed in the verses of Orpheus :

"I sing the night, parent of men and gods."

Aristophanes says :

"Chaos and Night, the first of all, take place,
 Dark Erebus, and gloomy Tartarus, „
 No Earth, no Air, until the God of Love,
 (When Time began,) who with his golden wings
 In mighty whirlwinds flew, temp'ring black chaos,
 Produced mankind, and brought them into light."

All this is in perfect agreement with the description that Moses gives of the evening in Genesis.

Virgil, in the 6th book of his *Æneid*, says :

"Principio cœlum ac terras, camposque liquentes,
 Lucentemque globum Lunæ, Titaniaque astra,
 Spiritus intus alit," &c.

Ovid also, in the first book of his *Metamorphoses*, closely follows the text of Moses :

"Ante, mare et tellus, et, quod tegit omnia, cœlum,
 Unus erat toto Naturæ vultus in orbe,
 Quem dixere chaos ; rudis indigestaque moles ;
 Nec quicquam, nisi pondus iners ; congestaque eodem
 Non bene junctarum discordia semina rerum.
 Nullus adhuc mundo præbebat lumina Titan ;
 Nec nova crescendo reparabat cornua Phœbe ;
 Nec circumfuso pendebat in aëre tellus
 Ponderibus librata suis : nec brachia longo
 Margine terrarum porrexerat Amphitrite.
 Quaque fuit tellus, illic et pontus et aër :
 Sic erat instabilis tellus, innabilis unda,
 Lucis egens aër : nulli sua forma manebat.
 Obstabatque aliis aliud : quia corpore in uno
 Frigida pugnabant calidis, humentia siccis,
 Mollia cum duris, sine pondere habentia pondus.
 Hanc Deus et melior litem Natura diremit :
 Nam cœlo terras, et tægis abscidit undas,
 Et liquidum spisso secrevit ab aëre cœlum.

Eurus ad Auroram, Nabathæaque regna recessit,
 Persidaque, et radiis juga subdita matutinis.
 Vesper et occiduo quæ littora Sole tepescunt,
 Proxima sunt Zephyro : Scythiam Septemque trionem
 Horrifer invasit Boreas ; contraria tellus

Nubibus assiduis, pluvioque madescit ab Austro.
 Hæc super imposuit liquidum et gravitate carentem
 Æthera, nec quicquam terrenæ fæcis habentem.
 Vix ea limitibus disseperat omnia certis;
 Cum, quæ pressa diu massa latuere sub illa,
 Sidera cœperunt toto effervescente cœlo.
 Neu regio foret ulla suis animantibus orba,
 Astra tenent cœleste solum, formæque Deorum:
 Cesserunt nitidis habitandæ piscibus undæ:
 Terra feras cepit: volucris agitabilis aër.
 Sanctius his animal, mentisque capacius altæ
 Decrat adhuc, et quod dominari in cetera posset.
 Natus homo est: sive hunc divino semine fecit
 Ille opifex rerum, mundi melioris origo:
 Sive recens tellus, seductaque nuper ab alto
 Æthere, cognati retinebat semina cœli.
 Quam satus Iapeto, mixtam fluvialibus undis,
 Fluxit in effigiem moderantum cuncta Deorum."

It is said, Gen. ii. 8, "The Lord formed man out of the dust of the ground." Agreeably to this is that of Sanchoniathon, according to the version of Philo Biblius: "One sprung from the earth." And Plato, in imitation of Moses, says: "The original of men was extracted out of the earth." Also Hesiod, in his *Ἔργα καὶ ἡμέραι*:

"Ἠφαιστον δ' ἐκέλευσε περικλυτὸν ὅττι τάχιστα

Γαῖαν ὕδρι φέρειν, ἐν δ' ἀνθρώπον θέμεν αὐδὴν, κ. τ. λ.

And Homer *Ἄλλ' ὑμεῖς μὲν πάντες ὕδωρ καὶ γαῖα γένοισθε.*²

The derivation of the soul is thus explained by Moses, Gen. ii. 7. "And breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." The same is almost literally expressed by Sanchoniathon:³ "Kalphijah, the voice of God's breath." Orpheus nearly expresses himself in the same manner:⁴ "Man was framed by God himself out of the earth, and received from him a rational soul." And in his poem "De Verbo Sacro," speaking of God, he says: "None hath ever seen God, but a certain man descended of the Chaldean blood." Add to this, that of Porphyry, who informs us that "Sanchoniathon⁵ gave an account of persons and places, the first origin of the universe, the chaos, &c. conformably to that of Moses; and that he extracted his account partly out of the annals of the cities, and partly out of the book reserved in the temple, which he received from Jerombalus, priest of the great God Jao." That this great God Jao is the same with Jehovah, appears from many parts of Diodo-

¹ Philo Bib. in Boch. Can. l. ii. fol. 734. ² Plato de Repub. l. iii. fol. 414.

³ Il. H. 99. ⁴ Philo Bib. ⁵ Euseb. ex Tim. Chronographo.

⁶ Porphy. l. iv. advers. Christian.

rus Siculus, who says that "Moses, among the Jews, owned the God of Heaven called Jao, as the author of his laws." Thus it is clear from the united testimonies of the most ancient writers, that Sanchoniathon, who lived about 250 years after the time of Moses, extracted from the books of Moses a great part of the Phœnician Theology.

Strabo, in his 16th book, mentions Moses, and is of opinion that he was an Egyptian priest, which he had from the Egyptian writers, as appears in Josephus. Pliny¹ also speaks of Moses; and Juvenal says:

"Judaicum ediscunt et servant ac metuunt jus,
Tradidit arcano quodcunque volumine Moses."²

Herhippus, in the life of Pythagoras, quoted by Josephus³ against Appion, observes, "These things he said and did, imitating the opinion of the Jews and Thracians, and transferring them to himself, for truly this man took many things into his own philosophy, from the Jewish laws." Some suppose that as the Bible was not translated into the Greek language in the time of Pythagoras and Plato, the theology of the Jews could not be known to the Greeks; but as Pythagoras travelled into Judea for the purpose of acquiring knowledge, there can be no doubt that he learnt the Hebrew language: and Aristobulus, who lived in the time of the Maccabees, writes to Ptolemy Philometer, king of Egypt, and affirms that the Pentateuch was translated into the Greek before the time of Alexander the Great, and that it came to the hands of Pythagoras and Plato, which is thus confirmed. Plato travelled over all Egypt, and acknowledges that the Greeks received their most valuable learning from the Phœnicians and Hebrews.⁴ From them, and in particular from Moses, he has borrowed so largely, that Numenius, the Pythagorean, styles him "*Mosen Attica lingua loquentem*." Moses describes the perfect state of man, Gen. i. 27, *God created man in his own image*; this description of the creation of man in the image of God is also mentioned by profane writers. Plato says, "In the days of old there flourished in the first men a divine particle of God."⁵ He also adds, "they did not converse with men only, but with beasts," which is the same as the Mosaic account of Eve and the serpent. He also speaks of the state of man in paradise: "Saturn therefore reigning, mankind enjoyed their vigor immediately after man was produced out of the earth; whence this age was truly golden." He also speaks agreeably to the text of Moses concerning the fall of man from the Adamic state. After discoursing

¹ Book xxx. c. 1.

² Sat. xiv. 101.

³ Book ii.

⁴ Plato in Cratylus, p. 426. and Bochart Phaleg. l. iv. c. 28.

⁵ Critias, fol. 106.

on the divine nature, which flourished in men in the golden age, he says,¹ "This divine nature being at last couterpered with the mortal or *sensual* part in man, the human inclination or custom prevailed, even to the pestilential infection and ruin of mankind, and from this fountain all evils rushed in upon men." Eumenius, of the first authority among the Pythagoreans, says, that "Plato stole out of the writings of Moses, whatever he had of God and the universe." This agrees with Clemens Alexandrinus, who, speaking of Plato, says,² "But as for laws, whatever are true, as also the opinion of God, these things were conveyed to him from the Hebrews." Hence it appears that Plato, as well as the ancients before him, had their information respecting the origin of the world and man, the purity of the Adamic state and departure from it, out of the books of Moses.

Another argument for the undoubted antiquity of the writings of Moses, and which no other writings however ancient can claim, is, that the Greeks, from whom the western nations derived their learning, own that they had their letters from Phœnicia, which have the same order, name, and shape, as the Syriac or Hebrew.³ Herodotus, in his *Terpsichore*, says, that "the Ionians learned their letters of the Phœnicians, and used them with very little variation; which letters were afterward called Phœnician." He also calls them "the Phœnician letters of Cadmus," because Cadmus, a Phœnician, first brought them into Greece. And Callimachus says, "Cadmus, from whom the Greeks derive their written books."⁴ Plutarch calls them Phœnician letters, in his 19th book, where he says, that "Alpha, in the Phœnician or Hebrew language, signifies an Ox." Eupolemus, in his book of the Kings of the Jews, says, "Moses was the first, a wise man, who delivered letters to the Jews, and the Phœnicians received them from the Jews." That is, the ancient language of the Jews and Phœnicians was the same. Thus Lucian, "he spake some words like the Hebrew or Phœnician." See also the learned men, who have written on this subject, as Scaliger's *Diatribes* on the Eusebian Year; the first book, chap. 10. of Gerrard Vossius's *Grammar*; Bochart, in his *Canaan*; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* book the 1st; and Eusebius's *Gospel Preparation*, book the 10th, chap. 5.

Diodorus Siculus⁵ says, that "Moses was the first of all legislators who, according to that ancient institution of life, which was in Egypt, persuaded the people to use written laws." And it also appears that the most ancient Attic laws, from whence the Roman were afterwards taken, owe their origin to the laws of Moses. A few instances of this may for the present suffice. In

¹ Critias, fol. 106.

² In *Admonitione ad Gentes*.

³ Grot. book i. sec. 16.

⁴ Grot.

⁵ Diod. Biblio. l. 1.

the law, which Sopater recites, "Let him that is next akin possess the heirress:" which is thus explained by Terence, "There is a law by which widows ought to be married to the next kinsman; and the same law obliges these kinsmen to marry them." Also the feast in which they carried clusters of grapes, taken from the feast of Tabernacles. The law that the high priest should marry none but a virgin, and his countrywoman. That next after sisters, kinsmen by the father's side should inherit, &c.

Plato, in his *Minos*, speaks of the lawgivers of Greece, and says, "they brought laws from Crete into Greece;" and Serranus informs us, that "the Cretans drew their laws from the Jews." This appears to be the truth; for, as the Grecian mythology succeeded the Cretan, and as the Cretan was consequent on the Phœnician, it is reasonable to conclude that the knowledge of the Phœnician or Hebrew laws, so far superior to all others, would be communicated also. That this was the fact is evident; for the Lacedæmonian code established by Lycurgus, and the Athenian by Solon, are, for the most part, substantially the same as the laws of Moses.

Now, as by the unanimous consent of the most ancient historians, the Grecians had nothing remaining equal to the antiquity of the Phœnician records, written by Sanchoniathon; and as it is proved that the Phœnicians received their literature from the Hebrews; it is evident that the books of Moses are far more ancient than the origin of the Phœnician, Egyptian, and Grecian antiquities, or the genealogies of all their fabulous gods.

JOHN BELLAMY.

STANLEII NOTÆ QUÆDAM IN CALLIMACHUM.

No. V.—[Continued from No. XXXVII. p. 55.]

IN HYMN. VI. *Eis Δήμητρος κάλαθον.*

QUARTO die Calathi processio fuit, ut existimo. Inter procedendum, acclamatum a mulieribus fuit, χαῖρε, Δήμητερ. Erat verò Calathi representatio, quo Proserpina flores lectos posuerat. Clemens meminit in *Protreptico*.

1. τῷ καλᾷθῳ.] In Eleusiniis Cereris adhiberi olim solere cistas ex Apuleio didici, qui ita *Metamorph. vi. Tacita sacra cistarum.*

Idem Met. xi. *Ferebatur ab alio cista secretorum capax, penitus celans operta magnificæ religionis.* Et Tibull. Eleg. I. i.

Et levis occultis conscia cista sacris.

Hanc arcam portantes κιστοφόροι appellabantur. B.

3. βέβαλοι.] Suid. βέβηλος ἀνὴρ, ὁ ἀμύητος καὶ μαρός. Εὐριπίδης.

—— οὐ θέμις βέβηλον ἄπτεσθαι δόμων.

3. χαμαὶ θασσεῖσθε.] Omnium affectuum vehementior assultus oculos deprimit; unde apud Alcimum

—— oculos attolle jacentes

est, animum perculsum erige. Sic de pudibundâ Hero Μυσεύς;

Παρθενικὴ δ' ἄφθογγος ἐπὶ χθόνα πῆξεν ὄπωπῇν.

Coluthus:—Ἡ δ' ἐρέεσσαν ἐπὶ χθόνα πῆξεν ὄπωπῇν.

Ovid. *Erubui, gremioque pudor dejecit oculos.*

Stat. Theb. iv. de Irâ. *Ille ad humum pallens unde et——*

Achilles Tat. Ἰδὼν οὖν καὶ γνωρίσας ἔφριξα, καὶ ἔβλεπον εἰς γῆν, κ. τ. λ.

Virg. Æn. vi. *Illa solo, &c.*

5. κατεχέυατο χαίταν.] Non quæ persudit (ut malè vertit Frischlinus) sed potiùs quæ effudit seu diffudit capillos, ut Stephanus rectè ad hunc locum: sed quod subjecit “hæc dicta esse à Callimacho de puellis, quæ passis seu sparsis capillis calathum sequebantur,” minùs rectè. Satis enim notum est apud Græcos meretricibus esse proprium comam alere ac promittere. Ergo cùm Nonnus de Mariâ Magdalenâ

—— ἀπεμάξατο μαχλάδι χαίτην

dixerit, τῇ τῆς αὐτῆς τῆς μαχλάδος voluit.

At quis non miretur hæc Frischlinum minùs quàm et ipsum Vulcanium latuisse, qui adeo infelicitè hæc interpretatus est ut me ejus valdè misereat? S.

Sed ad hoc videndus est clariss. Blomfield in loc. Et Kust. ad Aristoph. p. 222.

6. πτύωμες.] Quæ abominamur atque execramur, in ea despicimus. Oppian. Hal. III. 274.

—— ἀπὸ δ' ἔπτυσαν, ἐχθρήντες

Καὶ κομιδὴν καὶ χῶρον ὀλέθριον—

et Cyneg. I. 255. ἀπύπτυστος θάλαμος, i. e. execrandus. Sic Demosthenes Περὶ Στεφάνου adversarium suum Æschinem vocat κατὰ πτυστον. B.

12. οὐ πίες, οὐτ' ἄρ' ἔδες.] Unde νήστειρα dicitur Nicandro in Alexipharm., ubi Schol. τῆς Περσεφόνης ἀρπαγείσης ὑπὸ τοῦ Πλούτωνος, ἡ μήτηρ αὐτῆς ἡ Διὶ περιέρχετο νήστειαν αὐτήν.

13. ἀργυροδίναν.] Sic Apuleius Metam. iv. *fons emovebat undas argenteas.*

Oppian. Cyneg. ii. — ἀργυρον ὕδωρ
et Hal. i. ἀργύρεοι ποταμοὶ — τουτέστι, διαφανεῖς, λαμπροὶ, διανυγεῖς.

Sic noster in Jov. 19. Erymanthum vocat λευκότατον ποταμῶν, et infra habet ἀλέκτρινον ὕδωρ.

16. Καλλιχόρφ.] Putei Callichori, ubi consedissee Ceres commemoratur, meminit etiam Nicander in Theriacis.

28. ἐν πίτυς, κ. τ. λ.] Meliore consilio Robur esse fecit Ovidius quam Populum noster. Est enim sterilis nec quicquam ad Cererem — neque inter se illa conveniunt, quæ hic memorantur. *Quis enim terrarum locus unus* pyrum fert cum ulmo et pinu et populo? Scalig. Poet. V: viii. S.

62. ἀναγκαίᾳ.] Κατὰ παραγωγὴν pro Ἀνάγκῃ. Oppianus sexies eo utitur.

Callim. n Del. 122.—Ἀναγκαίῃ μεγάλη θεός.

Hom. II. et Odys.—Ἀναγκαίῃ γὰρ ἐπέιγει.

Herod. μάλιστα ἀναγκαίην φασὶν εἶναι, τὸν ὀφείλοντα καὶ τι ψεύδους λέγειν. loquitur de Persis, lib. i. 138.

Sic noster in Jov. 63. ἰσαίῃ pro ἴσῃ. B.

102. βούβρωστις.] βούβρωστις, ait Suidas, ὁ μέγας λιμός. εἴρηται δ' ὅτι βοῦς λυμαίνεται, καὶ τὰς βοῦς βρῶσιν ποιεῖ. Nugæ, o Suida. Imo ἐκ βον intendendi particulâ et βρῶσις potius est. Similia nomina sunt βούπεινα, ἡ μεγάλη πείνα· βούλιμος, ἡ ἐπιτεταμένη λιμός· βούθοινη, i. e. μεγάλη θοίνη· βουβῶν, οἷον μεγάλως βαίνων eis οἶδημα. Sic *bucera secla* apud Lucret. i. e. magnis cornibus prædita. Sic βουλιμιᾶν, βουλιμῶττειν, &c. omnia ἀπὸ τοῦ βον ἐπιρρήματος, ὅπερ ἐπιτάσεως ἐστὶ δηλωτικόν. Sic *improbam ventris rabiem* dixit Virg. Æn. ii. et *rabiem edendi*,¹ Æn. ix. Juv. Sat. xv. *vacui ventris furorem*; Ovid. Met. viii. *ardorem edendi*,² et *alti voraginem ventris*. Porro quod nomen hic substantive usurpavit Callimachus, eo Oppianus adjective usus est. Hal. ii. 208.

Λύσσαν αἰεὶ βούβρωστιν ἀναιδεῖ γαστρὶ φυλάσσει.

Hanc famem caninam veteres Latini furcillam, curcillam, et oppilaginem dixere, ut est apud Isidorum de Bulimix causis et remediis.

114. ἐνὶ τριόδοισι.] Proverb. *In triviis dictitatum* (vid. Erasm. Adag.) quo et Musæus utitur;

— ἐν δὲ σιωπῇ

Ἔργον ὅπερ τελεῖε τις ἐνὶ τριόδοισιν ἀκούει.

¹ Applicetur ad χαλεπὸς, ἄγριος, αἶθων λιμός in hoc hymno.

et quod Cicero pro Misenâ usurpat, *ex trivio arripere convicium*.

Virg. Ecl. iii.—*Non tu in triviis, indocte, solebas, &c.*

Apul. Met. lib. i. *Qualia solent fortunæ deterrimæ stipes in triviis erogare*: ad quem loc. vid. Beroald. In triviis autem potissimum mendici stabulantur, utpote locis frequentioribus.

115. αἰτίζων ἀκόλως.] Heliod. ii. Καὶ ἐμοὶ δοκεῖτε τοιοῦτε ὄντες, οὐκ ἀκόλους, ἀλλ' ἄορας καὶ λέβητας αἰτίζειν. (vid. Bourdel. in loc.)

Hom. Od. ρ. 222. αἰτίζων ἀκόλους, οὐκ ἄορας οὐδὲ λέβητας.

“Ακολοι sunt proprie ψωμοὶ ἢ τροφῇ, quam magistri vocant, ἐνθεσιν, quæ circa Prytaneum mendicantibus solebat erogari.

Αἰτίζειν apud Græcos, ut passim apud Demosth. acceptione quæ rogare apud Latinos sc. ‘mendicare;’ ut apud Catull., Mart., Juvenalem, &c. S.

124. ἀπεδίλωτοι.] Oppianus Cyneg. i. de Venatoribus,

— γυμνοῖσι δε ποσσὶν ἰδεύειν.

Hos infra vocat iv. 369. ἀβλαύτους,¹ πόδας, Callimachus ἀπεδίλωτους: Theocritus, Id. viii. ἀναλίπους. Sic Nicolaus apud Stob. xlii. περὶ νόμων καὶ ἐθῶν scribit, Κρητῶν παῖδας ἀνυποδήτους κατανύειν θήρας καὶ δρόμους ἀνάντεϊς. Callimachus Dianæ tribuit ἐνδρομίδας. (In Dian. 16.) Rittersh.

133. δωσεῖ πάντ'.] Diodorus, lib. i. Terram *Dimitera* a Græcis appellatam tradit, quoniam omnium sit mater, tanquam si particula superfluat. Melius Plato, qui ait Cererem Græcos appellare Δημήτερα, quasi διδοῦσα μήτηρ sit, hoc est, exhibens mater. B.

137. ἀμάση.] Prima in ἄμωμαι anceps est. Hic enim corripitur. Apud Oppianum vero Cyneg. ii. 56. Καὶ ἄμωνται ποσὶ γαῖαν, et i. ad fin. ἄμητος producitur. B.

138. μέγα κρείοισα θεάων.] Mirum cuiusdam docto videtur eam Divam omnibus cæteris anteponi, et Reginam quidem Dearum perhiberi. Ego vero mirum hoc prorsus non habeo: nam cum ex utilitate generis humani deorum dearumque honores et dignitates prisci metirentur, nemini sane divæ major honos dandus erat quam isti, cujus beneficio panis communi bono acquisitus est. Nec solum hoc Callimachus, sed et alii Græci poetæ celebres:

Hesiod.—Δημήτηρ μὲν πλοῦτον ἐγείνατο διὰ θεάων,

et Eurip. Phœniss.—Δημήτηρ θεὰ ἀπάντων ἄνασσα. S.

¹ Βλαῦτα, βλαῦδες, βλαντία soleæ. βλαέτη, εἶδος ὑποδήματος. Suid. ζαγρούς. B.

Literary Intelligence.

LATELY PUBLISHED.

STEPHENS' GREEK THESAURUS, No. IX.—(including two Nos. of the Glossary.) Price 1*l.* 5*s.*, 1. p. 2*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.*, which will soon be raised to 1*l.* 7*s.* and 2*l.* 15*s.* Total subscription 1086. No more are printed.

To this No. is prefixed an Advertisement, which we subjoin, p. 169.

* * * A few days after the publication of this Number, a most extraordinary article, professing to be a review of the four first Numbers, appeared in the Quarterly Review. We think ourselves particularly called on to notice this article, because the hostility of the Reviewer arose from some criticisms, which appeared in this Journal. He, and a learned friend of his, engaged in similar classical and editorial pursuits, had been among the earliest subscribers to the Thesaurus, and had expressed their approbation of the undertaking. But, before the appearance of the first Number, these unfortunate criticisms, which proved, but without the least asperity, that these two learned critics were not absolutely infallible, were inserted in the Classical Journal. The first symptom of their resentment was the establishment of a rival periodical publication. So far was the Printer of the Journal from feeling the least vexation on this subject, that he advertised and encouraged the work, thinking that each might promote the interest of the other; and the sale of the Journal accordingly rose after the publication of the other work. An early opportunity, however, was seized by these gentlemen of exercising much severity on some typographical inaccuracies in an article in the Journal, which had been left to the correction of the author, and which proved that the best writers are frequently the worst correctors of the press.¹

This was not all. The Printer of the Classical Journal, who is well known to have rested his fortune on the success of the Thesaurus, was doomed to destruction, *as far as it could be effected by the hostility of those gentlemen.* They not only refused to receive the first Number, but they engaged in a pretty

¹ It is a curious fact that one of the objections of our opponent was to *Mytilene* for *Mitylene*; and that afterwards the Critic corrected in his own work *Mitylene* into *Mytilene*.

active canvass to check the increase of the list of Subscribers. Every engine of torture was applied to decry the honest labors of the Printer, until the *coup de grace* was given by the article in the Quarterly Review, which we lament has introduced an attack so eminently fraught with *mala mens, malus animus*.

It is but seldom that a Printer can control the writings of the authors or editors of a publication; but we can witness that the Printer of the Classical Journal has on all occasions recommended moderation and candor. We have indeed proved our willingness to be actuated by the same spirit; we have often softened, and sometimes rejected, some critical articles tending to prove the fallibility of the Reviewer himself; we have particularly hitherto declined the insertion of a certain foreign Review, which we were desired to make known to the English scholar. As a proof of our conciliatory spirit, we need only refer to our notice of Matthiæ's Greek Grammar, in No. XXXIX. p. 214.; but alas!

Ἡ χάρις ἀλλάξει τὴν φύσιν οὐ δύναται.

Thus far on the real cause of an article, *the spirit* of which has been understood by all candid and impartial readers. On the article itself we shall say little, because the only part of it, which has a semblance of plausibility, is completely answered by the Advertisement prefixed to the last No. of the Thesaurus; so that our readers will form a judgment of the Reviewer's calculation of the 200 Numbers or 50 Volumes, and of 200, 400, and 250 and 500 guineas. He might have given credit to the Editors for some little knowledge of the Rule of Three, and of arithmetical progression. If they were destitute of that knowledge, they would have been instructed by Professor Hermann, who had warned them of the possible extent of their plan. But the Professor wrote with the candor of a critic, the feeling of an author, and the liberality of a gentleman; and for this, indeed, he has fallen under the lash of the Reviewer, who loves to scatter firebrands on every side, from which the character and fortune of the Editors may receive an injury: *et si non aliqua nocuisset, mortuus esset*. To him may be applied, with a slight variation, what he is pleased to say of the illustrious Professor: "he has intermixed a few trivial commendations, extorted from him by a sense of decency, amongst several pages of the most fulsome and unsupported (although we doubt not, unbought)

abuse."¹ But his praise is more than qualified by a proportionate quantity of censure. This breaks out on every occasion. After acknowledging the utility of Dr. Valpy's Grammar, he gives the preference to the "more copious and elaborate performance of Matthiæ." Of the latter we have spoken in terms of high panegyric; but we may ask the Reviewer whether his commendation is as impartial and disinterested as ours?

We have reason to believe, that the Editors never intended to carry their collateral criticisms and disquisitions beyond the letter A; but to establish a set of principles, to which they might refer in the subsequent part of the work. They are censured by the Reviewer for not delaying the commencement of it; but, had he seen a tenth part of the complaints, which were made of their delay, he would at least have been convinced of the necessity of publishing a Number, although of preliminary matter. His principal cause of condemnation is the size of the work; and yet he, with the inconsistency, into which illiberality flounders at every step, sneers at the abbreviations, which tend to diminish that size. He cannot have forgotten his advice to the Editors before they had incurred his resentment.

In undertaking a work of such important consequences, the Editors relied on the favor and generosity of those, whose patronage they solicited, and in which *they have not been deceived*. Had they, however, imagined a possibility of encountering much opposition from such a spirit, as animates the Reviewer, we think they would have paused before they embarked on an ocean, where they were likely to meet with such hidden rocks and shifting sands.²

Sed manum de tabula. We refer our readers to an article in the former part of this Number, written by a scholar not inferior in any respect to the Reviewer; and to a fuller answer,

¹ This insinuation it is not easy to meet in a suitable stile of indignation. Of the same nature are several of the Reviewer's other sarcasms, particularly the "suspicion" expressed by him that "the deceased subscribers" are those who "took the alarm, and declined having any thing further to do with the work." From his present state of intemperate irritation we might appeal to his future calm, conscientious reflection, were we not convinced of the truth of the remark of the great historian, *Proprium est humani generis odisse quem læseris*.

² If the Reviewer will turn to No. VIII. of this Journal, he will find the observations of the learned Chancellor of Oxford, Lord GRENVILLE, and of another writer, signed H., which in themselves were almost sufficient to assure the Editors of unconditional patronage and support.

which will soon be published, in reply to the particular observations of the Diatribe.

One word we may be permitted to add. We entertain as high an admiration of Porson, as any member of his illustrious College. Of that, indeed, our readers must be convinced, when they recollect how many of that great Critic's articles we have inserted in this Journal. More we have still to produce, for it is

"our plan,
To lose no part of that immortal man."

The *Advertisement to No. IX.* is as follows:—

The Attention of the Subscribers to the new Edition of H. STEPHENS' GREEK THESAURUS is particularly called to the following Advertisement, announcing the Plan, on which the Editors intend for the future to publish the Work.

ALTHOUGH many of the Subscribers in this Country, and some of those on the Continent, have given their approbation of the Plan, on which the Editors have hitherto been acting, with the increase, which has been the necessary result of so large an accession of the most valuable contributions; yet, as it would swell the Work to too great an extent, and require too much time for its completion, the Editors have felt it a duty to narrow their plan within more practicable limits, by *referring only* to passages instead of *quoting* them at length, in order to retain that general confidence, which the Subscribers have so generously reposed in them.

Indeed, without general confidence it would be vain to attempt a work of such magnitude. For a difference of opinion as to the best plan of editing it must ever necessarily exist among Scholars; and the situation, in which the Editors stand, from the peculiar nature of the work, and the pecuniary interests, which are involved in it, precludes the possibility of continuing that hitherto pursued, however useful or excellent in itself. That the Editors *have been supported* in a deviation from their original plan, they need only observe, that *not eight*¹ out of 1086 Subscribers have *declined* to continue the work. The Editors have, however, the satisfaction to add, that *since* the publication of No. I., they have received upwards of 130 additional names, at the advanced prices of 23s. and 25s., for the Copies of deceased Subscribers. The slow progress of the work, indeed, has been a subject of lamentation to

¹ Most of these resigned, as the Editors were assured, in consequence of a defalcation in their resources.

others, and *loss* to themselves, but the present arrangements must insure *a more frequent publication*, and will therefore be more satisfactory to the Subscribers. Indeed the whole is *confidently* expected to be completed within six years.

The contracted Plan, which the Editors, on due consideration, and with able advice, here announce as that alone, by which their *future* proceedings will be regulated, has been already brought into actual practice in the last half of the No. now published, as will be seen by the relative quantities of the old and new matter, which it contains. The VIth No. commenced with the 89th page, and terminated at the 127th, thus containing only 38 pp. of the original, exclusive of the incorporations of passages from H. Stephens' Index-Volume. But the present No. begins with p. 127, terminates at p. 251, and therefore contains 124 pp. of the original, *exclusive* of incorporations from the Index, many of which are very long.

The Editors, on the new Plan, will of course employ all their present MS. resources, and such as they may hereafter procure. But in the *new* matter it is their intention for the future wholly to abstain from extraneous criticism of every kind, to employ no quotations from any books of criticism, to indulge in no lengthened discussion on any word, and generally to content themselves with mere reference to ancient authors, instead of making quotations from them to vindicate the explanations, which they may give of the words introduced. If the Subscribers will turn to the last half of the No. now issued, they will see that this intention has already been carried into effect, and that the shortest possible mode of referring to books, of which the titles are long, is now followed. The Editors will be glad to adopt any suggestions, which the Subscribers may be able to offer for economising room still further.

One great advantage will result from the adoption of the plan, on which the Editors henceforth propose to act, that the Subscribers will have no difficulty in distinguishing the matter of H. Stephens from that furnished by the Editors themselves, because the former will always be given entire, and the latter always subjoined and placed within brackets.

The Editors, on the Plan of referring only, and not quoting, have made a *minute and accurate* calculation, from which they find that the Work *will not exceed* 39 Nos.; but they feel assured, that, when it is considered that the OLD EDITION could not, at the commencement of their undertaking, be obtained under 75 guineas, it will be allowed that the new Edition, with its great and various improvements and additions, is by no means expensive at 39.—A moment's reflection will show that it was impracticable, with all such improvements and additions, as have been introduced into their plan since their original Prospectus was issued, to print the work within that precise number of Parts, which was then contemplated as sufficient.

The Editors have made their calculation from the following statement of the pages, i. e. columns of the old work, which will be as obvious to every Subscriber, as it is to themselves :

	Nos.	Cols.
Numbers already printed	9	
In Vol. I. of old edition are 1946 pp. i. e. columns, of which are printed 251, leaving to be printed	1695	
Vol. II. contains	1712	
III.	1789	
IV.	831	
V. contains 1938, of which 308 are printed, leaving	1650	
VI. contains 913 pp.=1826 columns, of which are printed 666 pp.=1332 columns, leaving to be printed	494	
Labbe's Glossaries contain 988 columns, of which 908 are printed, leaving to be printed	80	
Total columns	8254	
8254 columns by 400, which each future No. on an average will contain, leave	20	254
On which 20 Nos. the <i>new</i> matter will be less than one-third, according to their future plan, but say :	7	0
N.B. In this are included the incorporations from Scott's Appendix to the Thesaurus.		
Lexicon Vocum Peregrinarum	1	0
Index—allowing for new matter, as the old matter is calculated in Vol. V. above	1	146
Total Nos.	39	0

It is presumed, that this total of Nos., though beyond what was originally specified, will not be thought objectionable, when the immense accumulations of new matter from Schæfer's Mss. &c. are considered, as well as the extension of margin, which was generally demanded by the Subscribers, and which in reality will nearly equal 2 Nos.

While the Editors are disposed to think that such of the Subscribers, as are competent to judge of the heavy expenses attending this undertaking, are perfectly satisfied with the present limitation of each No. to 170 pages, or 340 columns, as all which can reasonably be expected for the price; yet with the view of manifesting *their* anxious desire to reduce the work within as few Nos. as possible, and thus to render it less expensive, the Editors have determined to extend each future No. to 200 pages, or 400 columns. This, they trust, will at least remove any impression from the minds of their Subscribers, that they are actuated by mercenary motives, or capable of taking any advantage of those, who have so generously patronised their arduous, and national undertaking.

The Subscribers may, from seeing the extent of A, by far the most prolific letter in the Greek Alphabet, form an erroneous opi-

nion of the extent of the new matter. But A in the old work occupies 628 pages, whereas the whole of B, Γ, Δ, and more than half of E, are contained in the same number of pages. Many of the new words, particularly the compounds introduced under A, might with equal propriety, and with equal conformity to H. Stephens's practice, have been placed under some other letter. For instance, the words ἀβρόβιος, Ἀβρογάσσης, ἀβρογόσι, ἀβρόδαις, ἀβροκόσμητος, ἀβρομίτρης, ἀβροπέδιλος, ἀβρόπηνος, ἀβρόπλουτος, ἀβροσταγής, ἀβρόσιτος, ἀβροστολίστος, ἀβρότιμος, ἀβροτράπεζος, ἀβροχαιτής, might have been placed under βίος, γαστήρ, γόος, δαίς, κοσμέω, μίτρα, πέδιλον, πήνη, πλούτος, στάζω, σῖτος, τιμή, τράπεζα, χαιτή: and as the discussion of them occupies five columns, had they been so placed, the quantity of matter under A would have been so much the less.

It may be added, that, while the Ind No. appears to contain only two columns of the original, it in reality contains several incorporations of words, the discussion of which H. Stephens, for reasons, which he has stated, threw into his Index-Volume, besides 24 pages of H. Stephens's preliminary matter on A, and throughout Jablonski's Glossarium Vorum Ægyptiarum, which, with the Editors' Supplement, occupies the remainder of the No., H. Stephens's explanations of the Ægyptian words are given from his Index. The incorporations in this No., many of which are of considerable length,¹ amount to 205; and in No. III. they amount to 119. Thus the surprise of many persons at the *apparently* small progress made with the first letter of the alphabet would have entirely ceased, if they had examined the book, and had not merely collated the pages of the old and the new work. The Editors would add, that a number of words, wholly omitted by H. Stephens, and properly belonging to the other letters of the Greek alphabet, have been, for good reasons, in the Nos. already published, incidentally discussed, partly in the text, and partly in the notes; and 2ndly, that for reasons equally good, the Editors have often found themselves obliged to enter somewhat fully into the discussion of words belonging to other letters, which are not omitted by H. Stephens, but will occur in the Thesaurus as they proceed. These observations apply only to the Nos. which have been already published. The Editors do not intend for the future to indulge in any discussion whatever of words out of their proper places.

¹ See the Articles—Ἀθηνᾶ, Ἀθῆναι, Αἴγυπτος, Ἀμάρανθος, Ἀμμων, Ἀτταγάς, Βαῖς, Βᾶρις, Βύσσος, Ἐγκομβώ, Ζατρεύω, Ζέα, Ζητρεῖον, Ζώντειον, Θάλαππι, Ἰθάφαλλος, Κάλαῖς, Κάνωβος, Κάνωπον, Κιβώριον, Κίκι, Κιχώριον, Κολοκασία, Κόμμι, Κοράλλιον, Κουράλιον, Κύφι, Λαβύρινθος, Λωτὸς, Μάννα, Μίσου, Μύρον, Μυφίτης, Μύρβα, Νάπυ, Ὀλυρα, Ὀρυζα, Παναθήναια, Πάπυρος, Σάμψυχον, Σεμδαίς, Σέσελι, Σησάμη, Σίδη, Σινδών, Στίμμι, Συρμαῖα, Τίφη, Τσσωπος, Φαλλὸς, Φᾶσις, Φάγδας, Ψιμυθός.

The Editors have remarked in a former Advertisement the high value, which they, in common with many learned scholars, set on *Labbe's Glossaries*; and while they are reprinted entire for the ready use of those, who have occasion to refer to them only, the matter relating to each word is almost uniformly given under that word for the ready use of those, who are interested in its discussion: in so doing the Editors have merely acted on the plan of the judicious Ernesti in his Edition of Hederic's Lexicon, where the Glossaries are regularly cited as high authority.

The Editors uniformly indicate the sources, whence they derive their information, whether taken from printed books, or from Ms. articles, by subjoining the authors' names. When no name is given, the matter is to be considered as having been collected by the researches of the Editors themselves.

It has been the Editors' object to make the Thesaurus not a depository of their own particular opinions on certain points of Grammar and Lexicography, which would have been the case, if in the study of brevity they had omitted all notice of what has been said by Grammarians and Lexicographers on the topics under discussion, but to record what scholars of every age and country have written on matters, on which it would be high presumption in them to assume the exclusive right of deciding. But the Editors have not shrunk from an open avowal of their own opinions, whenever they have found themselves qualified to give them; and they trust that they have always given them with a sense of the imperfection of all human knowledge, and a sincere disposition to embrace any other opinions, which have fairer pretensions to accuracy and truth. In doubtful cases, the reader is left to form his own judgment by comparing what the Editors have transcribed from others with what they have said themselves. The Editors refer their readers to Dr. Burney's Preface to the Appendix to Scapula's Lexicon, from which they are inclined to believe that this part of their plan met with the approbation of that eminent scholar.

The Editors, aware of the difficulty of reprinting H. Stephens's most valuable Tract on the Attic Dialect with such additions and improvements, as the present state of Greek literature requires, have applied to Professor HERMANN for that purpose, whose name is sufficient to ensure the best possible execution of the work; and they believe that he has already made considerable advances towards it. The employment of this illustrious scholar is attended with the further advantages of saving all that time (and no doubt much would have been required,) which would have been otherwise consumed by the Editors themselves, if the performance of this duty had been left to them, and of securing to the Subscribers a more speedy completion of the whole undertaking.

With the same views of economising time, the Editors have re-

quested Professor DAHLER of Strasburg, who was recommended to their notice by Professor SCHWEIGHAEUSER as well qualified for the undertaking, to complete the *Lexicon Vorum pergrinarum in Gr. Scriptoribus obviarum*, and they have reason to think that the remaining portion of it is in a state of forwardness. Many of the articles, which now appear in the Index-Vol. of H. Stephens, and have so increased its bulk, will be thus placed in regular order and in a separate part of the Work, on a plan, which they have mentioned in a former Advertisement.

The new Index will be made with the greatest care, and constructed on the plan recommended by Professor Hermann; and, as it will immediately refer the reader to the words, however interspersed, all objections to the new Work in this respect will be satisfactorily obviated.

As some of the Subscribers have considered that the quantities of words should be marked, the Editors add that it is their intention, as they had before declared, to mark the quantities of words in the General Index, and they are inclined to think that this plan is on some accounts much preferable to that of marking the quantities of the words in the Text itself.

The Editors suppose that the formation of the new Index will of itself require at least six months, and, as they are anxious to save time in every possible way, they design to have it prepared by some intelligent and industrious Scholars, so as to be ready for the press as soon as the Editors are arrived at the conclusion of Ω .

If any of the Subscribers can suggest other means than those, which are above stated, for facilitating the progress of the Work, the Editors will be happy to receive their communications.

DELPHIN AND VARIORUM CLASSICS, XIII and XIV. Price 1*l.* 1*s.* small, and 2*l.* 2*s.* large paper. 967 Subscribers, large and small.

If any proof was wanting of the spirit in which the article in the Quarterly Review is written, the note on the edition of the Latin Classics publishing by the Printer of this Journal, is sufficient. The Critic is pleased to call the Delphin "the worst edition of the Latin Classics." With the least particle of candor, the Reviewer would have asserted, with great accuracy, that the different authors are edited with a considerable variety of merit. It will not be easy to find a work better edited than Virgil is by Ruæus, a Scholar, a Critic, and an elegant Latin Poet. It is, indeed, acknowledged, that some of the Classics are not edited with the same degree of ability.

But those who have seen the Prospectus of the new edition, will know that the text is not that of the Delphin edition; that

it is the best, which the learning, the researches, and the sagacity of the best modern Critics, have produced; that the best variorum notes are inserted; that the fullest bibliographical accounts of MSS. and editions are added. The editor cannot flatter himself with even the hope of obtaining any praise from a Critic so evidently hostile; but he is led to regard his individual sentiments as "the idle wind," when he perceives that he is supported by the suffrages of not less than 960 individuals, among whom are many of the first scholars of the age. It is indeed a gross libel on the judgment of so many subscribers to suppose they would patronise the worst edition, and not very complimentary to the prudence of the editor to suppose he would not take sage advice on a point so vital to his fame and fortune.

Testament de Louis XVI, Roi de France et de Navarre, avec une Traduction Arabe par M. le Bon. Sylvestre de Sacy. Paris. Imprimerie Royale. 1820.

A new edition of the *Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists* compared; by Bishop Lavington, one large Vol. 8vo. With Notes, Appendix, and an Introduction by the Rev. R. Polwhele. 2ls. bds.

This is a reprint from the scarce edition now selling for a very high price. The author's principal design is to draw a comparison, by way of caution to all Protestants, between the wild and pernicious enthusiasms of some of the most eminent saints in the Popish communion, and those of the Methodists in our country; which latter he calls a set of pretended reformers, animated by an enthusiastic and fanatical spirit.

Juvenal and Persius, from Ruperti's and Kœnig's texts, expurgated, with the Delphin Notes. No interpretatio. pr. 8s. bound. Oct.

At the suggestion of many Schoolmasters Mr. Valpy has published the *Delphin School Books* on this new plan; and should any difficulty occur in procuring them through the regular channel, he will most readily supply them on equal terms.

Virgil, with English Notes at the end, original, and selected from the Delphin and other editions. No interpretatio. Price 7s. 6d. Third edit.

The body of Notes forming the Appendix constitutes an excellent commentary upon Virgil; and must prove of peculiar benefit to the pupil in clearing up difficulties of the sense or the metre. But these explanatory notes are of still farther utility, as tending to lead juvenile minds into a train of enquiry that will expand their ideas and facilitate their progress in classical literature.—The notes of Voss in particular contribute highly to enrich the present impression, because they have been little known in this country, and were till now confined to the original German of that learned and acute critic.

Cornelius Nepos; with English Notes and Questions on the plan of Eutropius. By the Rev. C. Bradley. Second ed. 3s. 6d.

Recherches sur les Langues Tartares, ou Mémoires sur différents Points de la Grammaire et de la Littérature des Mandchous, des Mongols, des Ouigours, et des Tibétains; par M. Abel-Rémusat. tome 1er. Paris. Imprimerie Royale. 4to. 1820.

De Compositione Tetralogiarum Tragicarum Dissertatio. Auctore Godofr. Hermann. Lipsiæ. 1819. 4to.

Studii di Paleografia e di Bibliografia, Letti in adunanze accademiche (dal Sign. Barone Giuseppe Vernazza.) Torino. 1818.

Amedeus Peyron, Torinensis, vir doctiss., Dissertationem meditatatur de Nummis Phœnico-Tarsensibus.

Classical Excursion from Rome to Arpino, by Charles Kellsall. Embellished with engravings executed in Italy, illustrative of the Monuments and Villas of Cicero, and including a Dissertation on his political Conduct. To which is subjoined:—

An Excursion from Naples to the isle of Capri; with a chart illustrative of the Villas of Tiberius Cæsar. Geneva, printed for the Author, and sold in London by Mawman, Ludgate-hill.

This day is published, very handsomely and closely printed in Columns, in 4 vols. royal 4to. with complete Indexes, price 15l. 15s. Athenæ Oxonienses: the History of all the Writers and Bishops, who have had their Education in the University of Oxford, from the year 1500. To which is added, Fasti Oxonienses: or, the Annals of the said University. First written by

Anthony A. Wood, M.A. of Merton College; and now very considerably augmented, in *Text and Notes*, by **Philip Bliss**, Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford.

In the present republication of this valuable body of English Biography, (containing upwards of two thousand two hundred Lives,) every word of the two former editions has been retained with exact fidelity, so that the curious reader is no longer subject to the troublesome necessity of collating the book as first published by the author, with the subsequent edition given to the world by Bishop Tanner. Besides the text of the two former editions, that now offered to the public contains a vast number of notes by Bishops Humphreys, Kennet and Tanner, by Sir Phillip Sydenham, Dr. Rawlinson, Mr. Baker, Gray, Loveday, Macro, Morant, Peck, Wanley, Whalley and Watts, with several by the present editor, and many of great value, which have been communicated by intelligent persons now living: add to which, each volume contains some few new lives of persons whose connexion with the University had escaped the industrious enquiries of the Oxford biographer.

Subscribers not yet having received all their volumes are recommended to complete their sets without delay, as the publishers cannot undertake to supply any separate volume after six months has elapsed. The work may be bound either in four, or in five volumes, at the option of the purchaser; if the latter mode be adopted, the "*Annals of the University*" now attached to the second and fourth vols. by being placed together, form a fifth volume.

Histoire de la ville de Khotan (dans la petite Boukharie), tirée des annales de la Chine et traduite du Chinois; suivie de Recherches sur la substance minérale que les Chinois nomment Pierre de Iu, et sur le Jaspe des Anciens; par M. Abel-Rémusat, Professeur de Chinois et de Tartare au Collège Royal, etc. etc. Paris. 1820. 8vo.

De Deo Carmen Rossiacum illustris Derzavini Latinis elegis explicuit Stan. Czerski, Canonicus Brest. Græc. et Lat. Liter. præcept. in Gymn. Vilnensi. Vilnæ. 1819.

Table générale des Matières, par ordre alphabétique et chronologique, des 122 volumes qui composent la Collection complète du Magasin Encyclopédique; rédigée par I. B. Sajou, Imprimeur. Quatre Volumes in 8vo.: Prix 60 francs. A Paris, chez I. B. Sajou, Imprimeur, Rue de la Harpe, No. 11.

Pendant 21 ans consécutifs, depuis 1795 jusqu'en 1816, le Magasin Encyclopédique fut le dépôt où les Savans Français et

VOL. XXI. Cl. Jl. NO. XLI. M

étrangers s'empressèrent de consigner toutes les Découvertes faites en Europe. Cet ouvrage fut aussi le centre d'une Correspondance éminemment utile entre les amis des Lettres et les Savans, qui se plurent à l'enrichir de Dissertations et de Mémoires, dont la plupart ne se trouvent point ailleurs.

Pour faciliter la recherche de toutes les Matières traitées dans les 122 volumes du Magasin Encyclopédique, il fallait un guide sûr, c'est-à-dire, une Table des Matières raisonnée. C'est ce que vient d'exécuter M. Sajou, Imprimeur Editeur de ce Journal. Il a consacré trois années à ce travail important. La Table, que l'on doit à ses soins et à ses veilles, présente, à la fois, par ordre alphabétique et chronologique, l'analyse de toutes les Matières de cette Collection; le nom des Auteurs, avec les circonstances qui concernent leur personne et leurs ouvrages; les Découvertes de tous genres, soit sous le nom de l'auteur, soit sous le nom même du procédé, soit sous celui de l'instrument, ou de la substance.

Plusieurs Membres distingués de l'Institut de France, et autres Savans, après avoir examiné scrupuleusement cette Table, en ont fait le plus grand éloge. Plusieurs d'entre eux ont été portés à honorer de leurs suffrages l'entreprise de M. Sajou, avec d'autant plus de plaisir et de justice, qu'ils ont trouvé, sur le champ, dans le Magasin Encyclopédique, des objets qu'ils y recherchaient en vain depuis long-temps.—On peut dire que l'Ouvrage de M. Sajou est un Dictionnaire historique de la plupart des hommes célèbres, des Sciences, des Lettres, et des Arts, depuis 1795 jusqu'en 1816. Messieurs les Bibliographes y trouveront aussi un Catalogue détaillé d'une grande quantité d'ouvrages nationaux et étrangers qui ont été publiés, pendant ces 21 années, dans tous les Pays de l'Europe.

La Table du Magasin Encyclopédique était désirée du monde savant, depuis bien des années. Sa mise en vente ne peut que faire plaisir aux littérateurs, aux hommes studieux de toutes les nations, ainsi qu'aux Académies, sociétés savantes, et Bibliothèques publiques de l'Europe. Les possesseurs de cette intéressante Collection s'empresseront d'acquiescer cet utile complément, qui est la clef de l'ouvrage; et les savans, qui ne peuvent, aujourd'hui, se procurer les 122 volumes du Magasin Encyclopédique, à cause de sa rareté, et des 1250 fr., qu'il faut mettre à son acquisition, pourront, pour 60 fr., remplacer cet immense recueil, puisque cette Table leur en offre l'analyse exacte et raisonnée, par ordre alphabétique et chronologique.

Cette Table, qui n'a été tirée qu'à un très-petit nombre d'Exemplaires, ne sera vendue séparément que jusqu'à la fin d'Avril

prochain. Ce délai expiré, elle ne sera plus séparée de la collection complète des années dont l'Editeur est propriétaire. M. Sajou complètera, jusqu'à la même Epoque, les collections incomplètes, à raison de 10 fr. le volume, et de 48 fr. l'année. On peut se procurer, à la même adresse, la collection complète, en 126 volumes, de cet ouvrage important.

Memoirs of Dr. Walton, Bishop of Chester, and editor of the London Biblia Polyglotta, with important notices of his coadjutors in that illustrious work, are in preparation; by the Rev. H. J. TODD.

M. ROSENMULLER, Professor of Oriental Languages in the University of Leipsic, published formerly an elementary work for facilitating the study of the Arabic. It has been held in high estimation, and is now succeeded by a very complete Grammar, which unfolds the rules of syntax, with a perspicuity and precision that fully correspond with the wishes of the student.

The proprietors of a public journal published at Boulogne, entitled the *Telegraph*, have announced their intention to offer a prize to the author of the best heroic poem on the evacuation of Parga; an island given up to the Turks by the English government. The poets of all enlightened nations are invited to the competition. The prize to be a beautiful silver urn, with antique emblems, and bearing this motto, from Virgil:

‘ Nos patriæ fines, et dulcia linquimus arva,
Nos patriam fugimus.’

The following work is announced for publication early in 1820, ‘*Voyage dans la Grèce*, or a Voyage into Greece, by M. Pouqueville, late consul-general of France at Janina, correspondent of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles Lettres of France, and member of the Ionian Academy of Corcyra. This work is now in the press, (F. Didot, printer,) and will make four volumes in octavo, with plates, representing inscriptions and medals, and maps, by Dubocage, of the Institute. The two first volumes are finished.

The public have been already apprised of the publication, in the Armenian language, of the *Chronicle of Eusebius*; to which may be added, that Doctor Zohrab, who brought the manuscripts to Constantinople, has been an assistant to M. Majo, in the Latin translation, and in the publication, by augmenting it with a copious preface, with notes, and with the *Chronicle of Dr. Samuel*, an Armenian writer, who lived in the thirteenth century.

True Christian Religion, or the Universal Theology of the New Church : translated from the Latin of the Hon. E. Swedenborg, 2 vols. royal octavo.

A Grammar of the Arabic Language. By James Grey Jackson, Professor of Arabic; late British Consul at Santa Cruz, in South Barbary; Resident Merchant upwards of sixteen years in a country where the Arabic is the vernacular language; Author of an Account of the Empire of Morocco, and the Districts of Suse, Tafilelt, and Timbuctoo; of Critical Notes on an Account of Timbuctoo and Housa, by El Hage Abd Salam Shabeeny; and of Letters, descriptive of his personal Travels through West and South Barbary, and across the Mountains of Atlas, &c. &c. &c.—It is extraordinary that the many professors of that bold and figurative language of the East have never yet favored the public with such a desirable work.—An attempt will now be made, by the above author, to supply in England this deficiency in Oriental Literature.

Epigrammes choisies d'Owen, traduites en vers François par feu M. de Kérivalant, &c. et publiées par M. de la Bouisse. Lyon. 1819. 12mo.

De R. Bentleio ejusque editione Terentii dissertatio. Auctore G. Hermanno. Lipsiæ. 4to.

Dissertatio de Musis fluvialibus Gricharmi et Eumeli. Auctore G. Hermanno. Lips. 1819. 4to.

In Nuptias Friderici Principis et Carolinæ Austriacæ D. 26. Sept. 1819. Academia Lipsiensis. Carmen Lyricum. Lipsiæ. folio.

Proposals for publishing by Subscription, the Desâter; with the ancient Persian Translations, and Commentary, and a Glossary of the Ancient Persian Words. By Mulla Firuz Ben Mulla Kaus. To which will be added, an English Translation.—Whatever may be the result of the Editor's labors, he feels a consciousness that he has done whatever industry and diligence can effect, to make it worthy of the attention of the learned. An English Translation and Preface will accompany the Work. The Work will be published in two volumes, octavo, and it is expected the price will not exceed 35 rupees. Subscriptions will be received by Messrs. Smith, Rickards, and Co., No. 2, George Street, Mansion House; and Messrs. Rickards, Mackintosh, Law, and Co., 15, Bishopsgate Within.

We have been favored by Mr. Bolte, of York Street, with a list of new works published at the last Easter Fair, at Leipsig, for 1820.

We have extracted such as relate to Classical Literature, which may be had at Mr. Bolte's.

Benedicti, M. Traug. Fred., *Observationes in septem Sophoclis Tragœdias.* 8 maj. Lipsiæ, libraria Weidmannia. Charta impress. et scriptoria.

Bessel's, F. W., *astronomische Beobachtungen auf der Königl. Universitäts-Sternwarte in Königsberg.* 5te Abtheil. vom 1. Jan. bis 31. Dec. 1818. Fol. Königsberg, Universitäts-Buchh.

Bethmann-Hollweg, Aug., *de causæ Probatione.* 8 maj. (Berolini, Nicolai in comm.)

Biberstein, Marschall de, *Flora Taurico-caucasica.* Tom. IIus. 8 maj. Stuttgartiæ, Cotta.

Bibliotheca classica poetar. Græcor. T. XIIIus et XIVus. Cont. Euripidis Tragœd. e rec. A. Matthiæ. Tom. IIus et IIIus. 8 min. Lipsiæ, Weigel.

Ejusdem libri Tom. XV—XVIIIus. Homeri Opera cont. IV Tomi. 8 min. Ibid. Idem.

Bibliotheca classica scriptorum pros. Tom. Xus. Xenophontis Exped. Cyri. 8 min. Ibid. Idem.

Ejusdem libri Tom. XIus. Xenophontis histor. Græc. 8 min. Ibid. Idem.

Ejusdem libri Tom. XIIus. Xenophontis memorab. 8 min. Ibid. Idem.

Ejusdem libri Tom. XIIIus. Xenophontis Opuscula polit. equestr. et venat. 8 min. Ibid. Idem.

Ejusdem libri T. XIVus et XVus. Thucydides. II Tomi. 8 min. Ibid. Idem.

Ejusdem libri Scholiorum Græcor. Tom. Ius. cont. Excerpta ex Procli scholiis in Cratyl. Plat. prim. ed. J. F. Boissonade. 8 min. Ibid. Idem.

Bibliotheca classica latina edidit N. C. Lemaire. Tom. I ad VII. contin.: Tom. Ius J. Cæsarem; Tacitum, Tom. 1. 2. 3. et Virgilium, Tom. 1. 2. 3. 8 maj. Paris. Renouard. (Lipsiæ, Leop. Voss.)

Bothe, F. H., *Virgilius Virgilianus, sive Quæstio de Virgilii locis quibusdæm dubiis aut corruptis.* Accedit index, in quo poetæ omnis cum rerum tum verborum antiquitas proprietatesque breviter explicatur. 8. Heidelbergæ, Oswald.

Bretschneider, Dr. C. G., *Probabilia de evangelii et epistolarum Joannis, Apostoli, indole et origine.* 8 maj. Lipsiæ, Barth.

Cæsar's, C. J., *Commentarii de bello Gallico et Civili, una cum Hirtii vel Oppii supplementis.* Ed. nova. 8. Halæ, libraria Orphanotrophei.

Ejusdem Opera omnia, cura Hutten. Editio sec. 8 maj. Stuttgartiæ, Cotta.

Ciceronis, M. T., Opera omnia, deperditorumque librorum fragmenta. Textum accurate recognovit, potiorum lectionis diversitatem adnotavit, indices rerum et verborum copiosissimos adjecit C. G. Schütz. Tom. XIXi, pars 3ia. (Lexicon Ciceronianum. Tom. IIIi, pars 3ia.) 8. Lipsiæ, Gerh. Fleischer.

Ejusdem Opera omnia. Ad opt. libror. fidem edita. Tom. VI. VII. cont. Orationes. Tom. VIII. IX., cont. Epistolas. 12. Editio stereotypa. Lipsiæ, Tauchnitz.

Ejusdem, de officiis libri III, ad probatiss. quorumque exemplarium fidem emendati. Cum commentariis Car. Beieri, Prof. Lips. Lib. lus. Lipsiæ, Steinacker et Wagner. 8. charta pergamentina (velin), scriptoria itemque bibula.

Ejusdem, de officiis libri III. quibus accedunt : de Legibus libri III. Cato major, de Senectute, Lælius, de Amicitia, Paradoxa, de Petitione consulatus et Somnium Scipionis; ex nova recensione Ernestiana adjunctis lectionibus Gruterianis. 8. Halæ, libraria Orphanotropei.

Ejusdem Opera omnia, ex recensione Io. Aug. Ernesti. Editio nova. Tomus lus. 8. Ibidem Eadem.

Cornelii Nepotis vitæ excellentium imperatorum ad opt. editiones collatæ. Cura Dr. Io. Ioach. Bellermanni. Edit. alt. 8. Erfordiæ, libraria Keyseri.

Ejusdem vitæ excellentium Imperatorum cum animadvers. partim crit. partim historicis Augustini van Staveren cura Theoph. Christ. Harless qui et suas et Io. Kappii v. c. notas adjecit. Edit. alt. 8. Erlangæ, Heyder.

Ejusdem vitæ excellent. Imperatorum cum notis selectis Bosii, Lambini, van Staveren, Cellarii, Fischeri, aliorumque, quibus suas addidit Chr. H. Haenle. 8 maj. Hadamariæ, nova schola liter.

Demosthenis oratio pro corona in usum prælectionum recensuit E. C. J. Wunderlich. Edit. nova. 8. Gottingæ, Dieterich.

Etymologicum Græcæ linguæ Gudianum et alia grammaticorum scripta e codicibus manuscr. nunc prim. edita. Acced. notæ ad Etymol. magn. inedit. E. H. Barkeri, Imm. Bekkeri, Lud. Kulencamp., Amad. Peyronii aliorumq. quas digessit et una cum suis edidit Frid. Guil. Sturzius. C. indd. locupl. et fig. Tom. II Pars 2a et ult. 4 maj. Lipsiæ, Weigel.

Euripidis tragædia, Phœnissæ, cum scholiis Græcis e recens. Valkenærii edidit, indicemque verbor. copiosiss. adjecit Schütz. Edit. sec. et aucta. 8 maj. Halæ, Hendel.

Eutropii breviarium historiæ Romanæ ad Valentem Augustum

ab urbe condita ad illius usque et fratres Valentiniani tempora deductum. Editio duodecima. 8. Halæ, libraria Orphanotropei.

Ejusdem brevium historia Romanæ. Cum scholiis et notationibus in us. stud. juventutis editum ab E. Th. Hohler. 8 maj. Viennæ. (Lipsiæ, Liebeskind in c.)

Fähse, M. G., Observationes criticæ in Plutarchi opera, quæ inscribuntur moralia et in Hesychii Lexicon. 4. (Lipsiæ, Barth in comm.)

Frauckii, I. V., Examen criticum D. Junii Juvenalis vitæ. 8 maj. Altonæ, Hammerich.

Herodianus Historiarum Romanarum libri VIII. Ad opt. libror. fidem accurate editi. 12. Editio stereotypa. Lipsiæ, Tauchnitz.

Herodoti Halicarn. Historiarum libri IX. Musarum nominibus inscripti, Latine, ex Laur. Vallæ interpret. cum indicibus. Vol. II. 8 maj. Lipsiæ, Schwickert.

Hesychii, Milesii, Opuscula duo quæ supersunt, I. de hominibus doctrina et eruditione claris. II. de originibus urbis Constantinopoleos et cardinalis Bessarionis epistola de educandis filiis, Joannis Palæologi lingua Græca vulgari scripta. Græce et Latine. Recognovit, notis Hadr. Junii, Henr. Stephani, Jac. Meursii, Petri Lambecii, Gisb. Cuperi, F. I. Bastii aliorumque et suis illustravit Io. Conr. Orellius. Accedunt anonymi scriptoris Latini topographia urbis Constantinopolitanæ cum notis Guidonis Pancirolli et C. G. Heyni pars commentationum de antiquitatibus Byzantinis quæ ad Hesychium illustrandum pertinet. Cum indicibus necessariis. 8 maj. Lipsiæ, libraria Weidmannia.

Homeri Odyssea, Græce et Latine, opera J. G. Hageri. Vol. II. Editio quarta recens. Wolfianæ accommodata. 8. Chemnici, Starke.

Horatii, Q. Flacci, Opera. Ad opt. librorum fidem edita. 12. Editio stereotypa. Lipsiæ, Tauchnitz.

Ejusdem Opera collatis opt. editionibus in usum scholarum denuo accuratissime recusa. 8. Hanoveræ, bibliopolium aulicum Hahnianum.

Ejusdem Opera curavit Fr. H. Bothe. Edit. alt. emendat. 2 Voll. 8. Manheimii, Löffler. Charta impress., scriptoria et meliori.

Isæi Orationes quæ vulgo in editionibus leguntur. Ad opt. libror. fidem accurate editæ. Acced. oratio de Meneclis hereditate, Londini primum expressa et duplo auctior de Cleonymi hereditate, edita per Aug. Maium. 12. Edit. stereotypa. Lipsiæ, Tauchnitz.

Isocratis Orationes et Epistolæ. Ad optim. libror. fidem accurate editæ. Acced. plenior oratio de permutatione ab Andr. Mustoxyde, inventa exque ejus editione diligenter expressa. II Tomi. 12. Editio stereotypa. Lipsiæ, Tauchnitz,

Koch, Chr., Loca quædam Homeri et Taciti illustrat. 4. Marburgi, Krieger.

Lesbonactis, Soph., Declamatt. II quæ supersunt, Græce et Latine, recognov. annotatt. Canteri, Stephani aliorumque et suas notit. literar. et indic. verbor. adjecit J. Conr. Orellius. 8 maj. Lipsiæ, Reclam.

Liqn, A., Commentatio de ordine quo Plutarchus vitas scripserit. 8 maj. Gottingæ, Brose.

Livii, T. Pat., Historiarum libri qui supersunt. III tomi. Editio nova.* 8. Halæ, libraria Orphanotrophei.

Lucani, M. A., Pharsalia. Cum notis selectis H. Grotii integrisque R. Bentleii. Codicum novæ collatorum lectiones varias, appendicem indicesque adjecit C. Weberus. II Tomi. 8 maj. Lipsiæ, Gerh. Fleischer.

Luciani Samosatensis Opera. Ad opt. libror. fidem accurate edita. IV Tomi. 12. Editio stereotypa. Lipsiæ, Tauchnitz.

Müller, C. O., de tripode delphico. 4. Gottingæ, Dieterich.

Navarro, Dr. I., Tentamen de Archytæ Tarentini vita atque operibus. 4. Hafniæ, Reitzel.

Orellius, J. C., Symbola critica et philologica in C. Cornelii Taciti Germaniam e codice præsertim Turicensi denuo excuso. 4. Turici, Orell, Fuessli et Socii.

Orionis, Theb., Etymologicon. E Musco F. A. Wolfii primum edidit, annotatt. P. H. Larcheri ejusd. Wolfii nonnullas et suas adjecit F. G. Sturzius. 4 maj. Lipsiæ, Weigel.

Ovidii P., Nasonis quæ supersunt. Ad opt. libror. fidem accurate editi. III Tomi. 12. Editio stereotypa. Lipsiæ, Tauchnitz.

Ejusdem Amorum libri III., ad opt. libror. fidem accurate editi. 8. Tubingæ, Osiander.

Ejusdem Metamorphoseon libri XV. in us. scholar. ad opt. editiones diligentissime expressi. 8. Hanoveræ, bibliopolium aulicum Hahnianum.

Ejusdem Metamorphoseon libri XV. Editio duodecima diligentiss. expressa. 8. Halæ, libraria Orphanotrophei.

Ejusdem Tristium libri V. Editio quarta. Ibid. Ead.

Ejusdem Metamorphoses ad opt. editiones collatæ tironum institutioni accommodatæ. Studio et cura Dr. J. Joach. Bellermanni. Editio alt., integra et emend. 8. Erfordiæ, libraria Keyseria.

Philonis, Judæi, Opera omnia, græce et latine. Ad editionem Thomæ Mangey, collatis aliquot MSS. edenda curavit Aug. Fr. Pfeiffer. V. Volumina. Editio altera. 8 maj. Erlangæ, Heyder.

Phrynichi Eclogæ nominum et verborum atticorum, cum notis P. J. Nunnesii, D. Hoeschellii, J. Scaligeri et Cornelii de Pauw partim integris partim contractis edidit, explicuit Chr. Augustus Lobeck. Accedunt Fragmentum Herodiani et Notæ, Præfationes Nunnesii et Pauwii et Parerga de vocabulorum terminatione et compositione, de aoristis verborum authypotactorum etc. 8 maj. Lipsiæ, libraria Weidmannia. Charta impress., scriptor. et membranacea.

Platonis quæ extant Opera. Accedunt Platonis quæ feruntur Scripta. Ad optim. librorum fidem recensuit, in linguam latinam convertit, annotationibus explanavit indicesque rerum ac verborum accuratissimos adjecit Fridericus Astius. Tom. Ius, continens Theætetum, Sophistam et Politicum. 8 maj. Lipsiæ, libraria Weidmannia. Charta impress., script. et membran.

Ejusdem Dialogorum delectus. Euthyphro, Apologia Socratis, Crito. Ex recens. et cum latina interpretatione Frid. Aug. Wolfii.—In us. gymnasiorum. 8. Berolini, Nauck.

Ejusdem Philebus. Recensuit, prolegomenis et commentariis illustravit Dr. G. Stallbaum. Accedunt scholia Olympiodori in Philebum e cod. Cizensi nunc primum edita. 8 maj. Lipsiæ, Hinrichs.

Πλάτωνος πολιτεία, seu de republica libri X, edidit D. Fr. Astius. Editio altera emend. 8 maj. Jenæ, libraria Cröckeria.

Plauti, M. Accii, quæ supersunt Comædiæ. Ad opt. libror. fidem accurate editæ. Tom. Ius. 12. Editio stereotypa. Lipsiæ, Tauchnitz.

Plinii, C., Cæcilii Secundi, Epistolarum libri IX. Ad fidem maxime cod. præstantiss. Pragensis collatis ceteris libris scriptis editisve recensuit, præfatione, notis criticis, indicibus, et tabula ad representandam cod. Prag. scripturam efformata instruxit Franc. Nicol. Titze. 8 maj. Pragæ, Krause.

Plutarchi, Chæronensis, varia scripta, quæ Moralia vulgo dicuntur. Ad opt. libror. fidem edita. Tom. I—III. 12. Editio stereotypa. Lipsiæ, Tauchnitz.

Ejusdem, Demosthenes et Cicero, cura Hutten. Edit. secunda. 8 maj. Stuttgartiæ, Cotta.

Pompeii Commentum artis Donati et ejusdem in Donati de barbarismis et metaplasms commentariolus. Utrumque nunc primum edid. et brev. notis instruxit Frid. Lindemann. 8 maj. Lipsiæ, C. F. G. Vogel.

Prisciani, Cæsariensis Grammatici, Opera. Ad vetustiss. Codicum, nunc primum collatorum, fidem recensuit, emaculavit, lection. varietatem notavit et indices locupletiss. adjecit Augustus Krehl. Vol. II et ult. 8 maj. Lipsiæ, libraria Weidmannia. Charta impress. et scriptoria.

Procli, philosophi Platonici, Opera, e codd. mss. biblioth. reg. Parisiensis nunc primum edidit, lect. varietate, versione latina, commentariis illustravit Vict. Cousin. Tom. Ius, cont. III opuscula de libertate, providentia et malo. 8. Parisiis, Renouard, Treuttel et Würtz; et Argentorati, Levrault; et Lipsiæ, Voss.

Sallustii, C. Cr., Opera cum historiarum fragmentis, duabus epistolis ad C. Cæsarem et declamationibus, una in Ciceronem, in Sallustum altera. Editio emend. 8. Halæ, libraria Orphanotrophei.

Scholia antiqua in Homeri Odysseam, e codd. bibliothecæ Ambrosianæ Mediolanensis ab Angelo Maio eruta emendatius edidit, notulis illustravit, et scholior. Harleianorum excerptis Porsonianis auxit Ph. Buttmannus. Acced. variæ lectiones in Iliadem e cod. Ambrosiano antiquiss. ab eodem Maio in lucem protractæ. 8 maj. Berolini, Mylius.

Suetonii, C., Tranquilli, Opera. Textu denuo recognito brevi annotatione illustravit D. C. G. Baurgarten-Crusius. II Vol. 8. Lipsiæ, Gerh. Fleischer.

Sulpiæ Satira de corrupto statu reipublicæ temporibus Domitiani, præsertim cum edicto philosophos urbe exegisset; gallicis versibus reddita notisque illustrata a Car. Monnard. Edit. alt. Parisiis et Francofurti, Sauerländer. (Etiam sub titulo: la Satire de Sulpitia contre Domitien à l'occasion du décret par lequel il bannit de Rome les philosophes; trad. en vers français avec des notes par Car. Monnard. Sec. édit.)

Taciti, C. Corn., Opera in usum scholar. ad opt. editiones diligenter expressa. Tomus IIus. Edit. nova. 8. Halæ, libraria Orphanotrophei. (Etiam sub titulo: C. Corn. Taciti historiarum libri V. accedit de moribus Germanorum libellus, Julii Agricolaæ vita, de oratoribus dialogus.)

Terentii, P. Afri, Comædiæ. Ad editionem R. Bentleyi diligentissime expressæ. Editio stereotypa. 12. Lipsiæ, Tauchnitz.

Ejusdem Comædiæ, e recensione Rich. Bentleyi. Actus per accentus acutos expressi sunt, discentium commodo. 32. Berolini, libraria Maureria.

Virgilii, P. Mar., Opera, denuo curavit Fr. H. Bothe. Edit. altera emendatior. 2 Voll. 8. Manhemii, Löffler. Charta impress. script. et meliori.

Ejusdem Opera, studio singulari recognita. Editio septima.
8. Halæ, libraria Orphanotrophei.

Ξενοφώντος ἀνάβασις Κύρου. Xenophontis de Cyri expeditione commentarii, in us. scholar. recogniti et indice copioso instructi. Editio sec. auct. et emend. Accesserunt animadversiones nonnullæ et tab. geograph. 8. Halæ, libraria orphanotrophei.

Miscellanies in Prose and Verse; containing the Triumph of the Wise Man over Fortune, according to the doctrine of the Stoics and Platonists; the Creed of the Platonic Philosopher; a Panegyric on Sydenham, &c. &c. By Thomas Taylor. Second Edition, with considerable additions. Price 2s. 6d. 12mo. sewed.

Travels in various Countries of the East; being a continuation of Memoirs relating to European and Asiatic Turkey, &c. Edited by the Rev. R. Walpole, M.A. Lond. 1820. 2 vols. 4to.

Travels in various Countries of the East, more particularly Persia. A Work wherein the Author has described, as far as his own observations extended, the state of these Countries in 1810, 1811, and 1812; and has endeavoured to illustrate many subjects of Antiquarian Research, History, Geography, Philology, and Miscellaneous Literature, with extracts from rare and valuable Oriental Manuscripts.—By Sir William Ouseley, L.L.D. Vol. First. London, 1819. Rodwell and Martin. Two more Vols. are to follow.

NOTES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Ουτις from Hull came too late.

Observations on Herodian in our next.

R. H. on Horace in our next.

If any of our readers shou'd possess a copy of "Wassenberg de Transpositionibus," we should be glad of the loan of it to reprint in our future pages.

T. P. justifies the use of the "indicative after interrogatives in an indefinite sense," to which we have frequently objected, and appeals to the authority of Cicero, as quoted in a late Review: "Quantum facinus ad nos delatum est videtis." We beg he will turn to a good edition of Cicero, and he will find that the passage, as written by that great master of Latinity, corroborates our opinion.

Belfastiensis is not forgotten.

In our next No. we shall give an interesting article on the present state of literature in Greece.

The Interpretation of Psalm 87 shall be published.

W. W.'s article requires more consideration.

We have received several valuable articles from the Continent, to which we shall pay a proper attention.

[*Advertisements.*]

This day is published, 8vo. 15s.

THE COMEDIES OF ARISTOPHANES,

By T. MITCHELL, A.M.

Late Fellow of Sidney-Sussex College, Cambridge.

Printed for JOHN MURRAY, Albemarle Street.

This day is published, in two Volumes, Royal Octavo,
Price 2l. 2s. in Boards,

A TRANSLATION of the WORKS of VIRGIL,

Partly original, and partly altered from Dryden and Pitt.

By JOHN RING.

Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, Paternoster Row ; and W. Carpenter, Lower Brook Street.

Of whom may be had, by the same Author, Price 6s. in Boards, the **COMMEMORATION of HANDEL**, the Second Edition, and other Poems.

THE
CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

• N^o. XLII.

JUNE, 1820.

ON THE INSTRUCTION AND CIVILISATION OF MODERN GREECE.

THE present state of Greece has frequently been a subject of reflection to those, who know the early history of that country, and its glory in former days. The vestiges of ancient greatness are to be traced by the traveller; the people retain an echo of that language, which in old times was so harmonious, so eloquent, and so powerful; and the generation before us calls to our recollection the heroes, the poets, the philosophers, the orators, the historians, of yore, who adorned that brilliant spot of the civilised world. A veneration and a predilection for Greece are bred and nourished in the breasts of all who enjoy the benefit of classical instruction; and there are many who look to that quarter as a source, from which they have derived some of their most valuable knowledge. Others justly consider the debt, which the enlightened and learned world of modern days owes to the influence of that illustrious country. The sciences, the arts, the civilisation of our times, and all that the human mind esteems as its most precious acquisitions, stand in a certain relation with ancient Greece, and have to acknowledge benefits obtained, directly or indirectly, from its genius. To see that country in its present state of humiliation, under the power of an arbitrary government, and connected with an illiterate and untaught people, who hold it in servile subjection, as conquerors; to reflect that a tract, which nature seems to have marked for the

abode of the Muses, is overwhelmed with ignorance and barbarism ; and, on the other hand, to conceive the idea of rescuing, by our efforts, the country and its inhabitants from so deplorable a condition, and to restore them, in some degree, to those rights to which they seem to be entitled—are matters which cannot fail to make an impression on the generous feelings of the present enlightened age. The scholar, above the rest of his cotemporaries, who owns particular obligations to that country, will be accessible to such sentiments : and it might thence be presumed, that in England, where ancient literature is so much esteemed, and the recollection of ancient Greece and Rome so fervently cherished, numerous advocates would be found interested in this cause. It deserves consideration, that the modern Grecians still preserve themselves as a distinct people, and that they are not confounded with those who subdued them ; and what is more, that they still regard themselves as the descendants of the Greeks of old, nor have, in their misfortunes, lost the recollection of what they formerly were. They feel a strong desire to emancipate themselves from that mental servitude, under which they have been kept, and to make amends for that degeneracy, with which they have been charged. These feelings have, at different times, been manifested, but more particularly of late : and they seem to show that the nation is actually in a state of intellectual improvement. Some individuals among them are even distinguished for their literary acquirements ; and it is only necessary to name *Capo d'Istria*,¹ *Coray*,² *Mestosidi*,³ *Ignatius*,⁴ *Rhasis*,⁵ *Anthimos Gazy*,⁶ and *Nicolopoulo*,⁷ to convince us that learning and knowledge are not entirely lost among the descendants of Plato and Aristotle. Men of this description were alive to the situation of their country, and animated with the noble ambition of raising it to a level with the rest of the civilised world. They were sensible that this could only be done by spreading instruction and knowledge among the people. For this purpose they determined to combine their efforts, and they formed, about the year 1813,⁸ a society at Athens, called

¹ A man known and esteemed for his enlightened and liberal mind.

² Justly placed among the literary men of the present day : he generally resides at Paris.

³ Secretary to the Senate at Corfu.

⁴ An eminent ecclesiastic of the Greek church, and a zealous friend to the cause.

⁵ Rhasis the elder is physician to the Grand Vizier at Constantinople ; his son is professor at Paris.

⁶ Chief pastor of the Greek congregation at Vienna, editor of a Greek Lexicon, and of the well known Greek Journal, *Ερμής ο λόγιος*.

⁷ One of the under librarians at the French Institute.

⁸ I am not in possession of distinct information concerning the date at which the society was established, but 1813 seems to be the year. This I conclude from an address to the Germans, written by a Grecian, in German,

the *Friends of the Muses*, 'Η Εταιρία τῶν Φιλομούσων, or, 'Η Φιλόμουσος' Εταιρεία, on whom it was imposed as a duty to promote literary and popular education, and as it were to bring back the Muses into their deserted country.

The society had scarcely been established, when it proceeded to the execution of its designs: no time was lost. The first step they took was the foundation of a school at Athens. There had been schools at Athens before, and Chandler particularises two, which existed in his time, that is, in the years 1765 and 1766.¹ One of them had an annual income, arising from a legacy which a benevolent Athenian had bequeathed, and which was to be paid by the Bank of Venice. But the payments were not regularly made, and ceased entirely when the Bank of Venice was closed.² These schools were not adequate to the purpose of furnishing the necessary instruction, especially after the latter had been deprived of its resources. The elder Rhasis, who visited Athens about the year 1813, found them in a deplorable condition; and he was the first who thought of their renovation and improvement. He used his influence to that effect at Constantinople, with the government, and with the Greek patriarch, and was assisted by the principal inhabitants of Athens. He found a most active co-operation from the Friends of the Muses: and a school has, by these united endeavours, been established, which promises to extend its beneficial influence not only over Attica, but the whole of Greece. There are schools in other places, for the instruction of Grecian youth; in Smyrna, Chios, Constantinople, Bucharest, Yassi (in Moldavia), in Cydonia (a small town in Asia Minor), and in almost every place that calls itself a town; but the sum total of what they have produced is much below what the country required. The foundation of the new school at Athens, on a more comprehensive and efficient plan, was therefore a measure of great importance.

Another advantage was soon after gained by the creation of a second establishment in Thessaly, near Mount Pelion. In this undertaking the principal merit belongs to Anthimos Gazy. *Melida*, the town where that establishment is situated, was his native place. It had a school, upon a small scale, so early as 1770, when that school was founded by a man of the name of Anthimos, who

July 5, 1814, in which he says, that the society has scarcely existed a year. This paper, together with others, was communicated to me by Professor Thiersch, at Munich.

¹ See Chandler's *Travels in Greece*, chap. 25. p. 121. (Oxford ed. 1776. 4to.) His words are: "The Athenians have two schools, one of which possesses a small collection of books, and is entitled to an annual payment from Venice, the endowment of a charitable Athenian, but the money is not regularly remitted."

² See *Millin's Magazin Encyclopédique* for the year 1818, vol. I. p. 318.

left a sum of money to maintain it. Anthimos Gazy, inspired with a love for his native place, and for his country in general, conceived the design of enlarging that school, and forming it into an institution, which might be extensively useful. He did not hesitate to employ his fortune in the enterprise, and in conjunction with some friends, nominally two, *Gregorius Constanta*, and *Daniel Philippides*, he carried his views into execution. Thus a most respectable seminary arose, in the same spot, it is said, where in old times Achilles received his education from Chiron. It is called *Λύκειον Μηλιωτικόν*,¹ or *Γυμνάσιον Μηλιωτικόν*; and is patronised by the Greek Patriarch and Synod of Constantinople, but derives its chief support from the society of the Friends of the Muses at Athens. Anthimos Gazy furnished it with considerable buildings, for a library, and the different rooms and apartments that were required. He gives an account of it, in the *Ἑρμῆς ὁ ἅγιος*, and states the number of the books in the library, at the time when he wrote, (about five years since,) to amount already to upwards of 8000 volumes.² It was desired that it should represent what we call a university, and that the subjects taught there should be of a higher order than those at ordinary schools, or even that of Athens. The situation of *Meliès*, at the foot of Mount Pelion, near Zagora and Macronissi,³ is peculiarly favorable to a retreat of the Muses. It is remote from the jealous eye of the Turkish governor, and still more secured from his encroachments by certain privileges and immunities, which have been granted to the town by the government. These circumstances fully justify the preference given to that spot, over any other part of Greece, for the site of a literary establishment, and happily coincided with the predilection which Anthimos Gazy cherished.

The society of the Friends of the Muses (*τῶν Φιλομούσων*) at Athens, had not been long instituted, when, in the year 1814, it occurred to some members of it residing at Vienna, that it might be practicable to obtain the aid of some of the enlightened and liberal inhabitants of other parts of Europe: and it seemed that the congress of the European nations, which was about that time assembling in the capital of the Austrian dominions, afforded an opportunity peculiarly favorable. When so many strangers were collected, and among them persons of the highest rank and distinction, it was thought likely that the cause of Greece would not be pleaded in vain before the tribunal of generosity. A subscrip-

¹ The names of *σχολή*, *σχολεῖον*, *λύκειον*, *γυμνάσιον*, might perhaps be promiscuously applied to both establishments; but it seems that *σχολεῖον* is more particularly appropriated to that of Athens, and *γυμνάσιον* to that of Mount Pelion; and that the latter is intended to denote an institution higher than a school, one that approaches to a university.

² See *Magazin Encyclopédique*, p. 312.

³ Ibid. p. 311. note.

tion was opened, which met with encouragement so far, as to induce the formation of an association at Vienna, which was to be united with the society at Athens. It was placed under the direction of Ignatius, the Greek metropolitan at Vienna ; and was organised so as to make its contributions available to the attainment of the objects in view. These were, in the first place, the support and maintenance of the two literary establishments in Greece, the school at Athens, and the Gymnasium of Mount Pelion ; but the views enlarged with the hope and expectation of increasing means. Additions and improvements were contemplated : besides the pay of teachers, books, maps, and instruments were to be purchased ; poor scholars to be maintained ; and what was more, promising young men were to be sent to the German universities, at the expense of the society, to enrich themselves with stores of knowledge, which they might afterwards impart to their countrymen at home. The society was likewise solicitous to render some service to the sciences themselves, and to literature in general ; and accordingly ordered, that the collecting of antiquities should be attended to, and that investigations should be made in the natural history of the country, and especially in Botany. With a similar intention it directed, that some of its members residing at Athens, should be in readiness to accompany and assist any foreign traveller who, for the sake of information, might visit Attica. If these various projects should succeed, if a foundation for learning and knowledge be once laid in the country, and if encouragement and support continue to be given, the work of civilisation will proceed quickly, and the character of the people, and the face of the country, will be greatly changed for the better. For instruction will be multiplied, ignorance will be dispelled, industry and morality improved, and the difference between the modern Greeks and their progenitors considerably lessened.

But while these flattering and pleasing ideas are indulged, it is impossible not to remember the power of despotism which hovers over the country, and which with its chilling gripe may at once destroy the fruits of the exertions of many laborious years. But nevertheless the friends of mankind ought not to be discouraged from laying their hand on so meritorious a work. Even if complete success is but a matter of chance, it is worth the trial, and efforts, in themselves so laudable, though in the end defeated, while they may leave regret at the failure, will, at the same time, bequeath the satisfaction, that what was done proceeded from a virtuous and rational motive, that can find its reward in the consciousness of a right intention. We will, therefore, not view the shade of the picture, but look with cheerfulness on the bright side, to stimulate our efforts.

It will be proper to say a few words on the organisation of the Athenian Society, with which that at Vienna may be considered as

forming one body. The members are divided into two classes, one the *συνήγοροι*, or fellows, and the others the *εὐεργέται*, or benefactors. The difference of the denomination arises from a difference in the annual subscription, which is altogether very moderate. The yearly contribution of three Spanish dollars, equal to about 12s., constitutes a *συνήγορος*; double that sum, or three Dutch ducats, equal to 24s., gives the title of *εὐεργέτης*. There is no essential, but a mere honorary, distinction between these members. Instead of receiving a diploma from the society, they wear rings as badges, which have either the emblem of an owl, (*γλαῦξ*), in reference to Athens, or that of the Centaur (*εἰκὼν τοῦ Κενταύρου καὶ τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως*) with little Achilles, in allusion to the Institution at Mount Pelion. I believe it is a matter of indifference, whether the Athenian or Thessalian ring is worn; both equally designate a Friend of the Muses; there is only this peculiarity observed, that the ring assigned to the *εὐεργέται*, or benefactors, is of gold (*δακτύλιον χρυσοῦν*), and that given to the ordinary members, or *συνήγοροι*, of bronze or copper, (*δακτύλιον χαλκοῦν*). The Athenian ring has the inscription *Φιλομούσων*, "of the Friends of the Muses;" the Thessalian of *Μουσαγετῶν*, "of the Leaders, or Guides, of the Muses." The title *Μουσαγέτης* originally belongs to Apollo, but may here be understood to be applied to those, who, as it were, lead back, or conduct, the Muses into the country which they had abandoned. The society would, of course, be glad to receive likewise aid, in any other way, besides the annual contributions, which would be equally appropriated to the proposed objects. The names of the members are entered in a book, and published in the Greek literary journal, *Ἑρμῆς ὁ λόγιος*; and to do them still more honor, they are engraved at Athens, upon tablets or pillars of white marble (*εἰς στήλας λευκοῦ μαρμάρου*). Towards the end of the year 1814, or the beginning of 1815, the number of the members amounted to near 200. For the regular administration of the funds, a board or office was established at Vienna, under the management of Mr. Alexander Basil, a Greek merchant, as the treasurer. The money, as has before been intimated, is applied, 1. to pay the teachers of the two establishments. 2. To the repair and improvement of the buildings. 3. To the purchase of books, maps, instruments, models, and all useful articles. 4. To rewards, or prizes, for the scholars who distinguish themselves. 5. To the maintenance of poor scholars. 6. To the support of such as are sent to the German universities. To this may be added, the expences which the collecting of antiquities may occasion. They are to be preserved in appropriate buildings, called *Musea*, both at Athens and Meliès. How far the funds may be adequate to all those objects, I cannot say: it will require a liberal support to make the income meet the intended expenditure. The Grecians themselves feel a great interest in the attainment of what is designed, which is, as it is some-

where expressed, ἐπίδοσις τῶν μαθήσεων καὶ Εὐρωπαϊκὸς πολιτισμὸς, "promotion of the sciences, and European civilisation;" but, unassisted, they would not have the means of realising their wishes.

A new prospect seemed to open at Munich. There much enthusiasm had been created by an account, which *Professor Thiersch* had given of the efforts that were making in behalf of Greece, and of the views and hopes that were entertained. He had represented these objects, guided by the warmth of his own feelings, in a paper read before the Academy of Sciences. Some of the members were electrified with the spark of sympathy, and ardently embraced the suggestions of the Professor. The Secretary-general of the Academy, Mr. Schlichtegroll, in particular, eagerly entered into the subject. It was determined to take an active part in the cause; and the question arose, whether it should be proposed to government to make it a subject of public concern: but it was wisely decided to leave the work to the private exertions of individuals, who by their zeal might produce as much good as the government, and would not excite the jealousy of the Turks, as if the sovereign of a foreign country, or his ministers, were suspected to interfere in the affairs of their subjects. Besides, it was more easy for persons of different countries to combine with a private association, than to submit themselves to the regulations of a government not their own. But though this point was so determined, the Bavarian ministers, and the King and Prince Royal themselves, expressed their approbation of the undertaking, and, divested of their public characters, gave it their countenance, by becoming subscribers. The enthusiasm that was felt, is not difficult to account for; and I confess, that I was affected with it myself, under the first impression. For there is something captivating to the mind, in the thought, that we are discharging a debt of gratitude towards the ancient Grecians, our masters and instructors, and conferring benefits on the posterity of the great and illustrious men of antiquity. These sentiments, I anticipated, would become very current in England, and would warm the breast of every scholar. I concluded, that very powerful support would be derived from this opulent and generous country: the present address to the public, added to that of Adamantius Coray, printed in the *Classical Journal*, No. 40., may perhaps be more fortunate than my former endeavours. At Munich, Messrs. Schlichtegroll and Thiersch received subscriptions, and it was under the auspices of these gentlemen that my name was, in July, 1815, when I was at Munich, added to the list of the members. There was an intention of establishing a board of the society in the capital of Bavaria, and probably to transfer the administration thither from Vienna. I have, however, not heard since, what steps have been adopted; or learnt whether the society prospers, or languishes, whether its friends increase in number, or whether the

zeal that promoted it has died away. Whatever those who have the welfare of modern Greece at heart, may undertake—in whatever speculations they may engage—it ought always to be remembered, how essential and necessary it is to be cautious in their proceedings, and above all things to take care not to give umbrage to the Turkish government. The fruits of the labor of many years may be lost by a single indiscretion: for what will resist the power, or moderate the violence, of that government, if its suspicions are roused, or its pride offended? The poor Greeks would be the sufferers: their improvement would be arrested, their institutions annihilated, and they would be thrust back into their former state of helpless inability, and of mental servitude. Nothing of a political nature ought to be mixed with the efforts that are used: and whatever a lively imagination may conceive to be the ultimate result of a more civilised condition of Greece, produced by instruction, it will be prudent to check those flights of fancy, and to keep such thoughts under the seal of a judicious silence.

It has been mentioned, as part of the plan which the society τῶν Φιλομούσων had formed, that Grecian youths were to be sent to the German universities. For this purpose such individuals were to be selected, as were distinguished by abilities and talents. But to render their peregrination useful, certain preparatory studies were necessary. Not only was it fit, that they should be in possession of that elementary or fundamental knowledge on which the sciences are to be built; it was also expedient, that they should understand the German language, which was to be the vehicle of their instruction. To this end, Prof. Thiersch resolved to establish at Munich, an academy or preparatory school for young Grecians; and this speculation succeeded. He called the institution *the Athenæum* (τὸ Ἀθηνæιον), and these are the outlines of the plan. 1. It is to receive youths of more than 12 years of age, who are expected to know their own language, modern Greek, so as to be able to read and write it. Nothing more is required of them, in point of knowledge. The Professor himself had made the modern Greek his study; and was sufficiently conversant in it, to understand, and be understood by, his pupils. Practice would every day add to the facility of intercourse. 2. The subjects to be taught in the Athenæum were, first of all, *German*; then ancient Greek, and Latin. As to the ancient Greek, this is not neglected in Greece itself, but it forms a branch of instruction to those that are well educated, though the lower people are ignorant of it. Besides those languages, geography, history, mathematics, natural history, and physics, were to be attended to: and an opportunity was also to be afforded of learning other modern languages, besides the German, such as Italian, French, and English. They were also to be allowed to bestow a certain portion of their time on music and drawing, if their inclination and talents led them to these accom-

plishments. 3. From the Athenæum they might pass into the Lyceum, or public school, at Munich, and thence proceed to a university. The terms which the Professor fixed, to cover the expences, were, 100 ducats per annum for each pupil, which is about 45*l.*, according to the present course of exchange, besides the charges for clothing, and other items. The establishment of the Athenæum was announced to the inhabitants of Greece, by Prof. Thiersch, in an advertisement written in old Greek, which he styled, *Ἀνακήρυξις εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας*, bearing date, April 17, 1815: and when I visited the Professor in July of the same year, he had three pupils in the Athenæum. In the following October, when he was, for a short time, in England, he informed me that the number was augmented, if I am not mistaken, to 7 or 8. I presume, that it has continued to increase; but I have had no late intelligence.

The information which I have communicated, is partly derived from my conversations with Messrs. Schlichtegroll and Thiersch, and partly from some printed papers, which the latter put into my hands. They are: 1. A Greek Epistle, written by Count Capo d'Istria, to Mr. Alexander Basil, merchant at Vienna, in which he speaks of the Athenian society *τῶν Φιλομούσων*, and of the association to be formed in aid of it, at Vienna. The inscription of the Epistle is: *Ἰωάννης Ἀντωνίου Κόμης Καποδιστρίας τῷ Κυρίῳ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ Βασιλεῖ χαίρειν*. Opposite to the Greek, there is a French version. 2. Project of regulations for the management of the Vienna Society, also in Greek and French. It is called *Διαταγή*, in French *Règlement*. 3. A brief account of the foundation of the Athenian Society, and of the Gymnasium at Mount Pelion, like the former pieces, in Greek and French, with these inscriptions: *Σύστασις τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἑταιρείας τῶν Φιλομούσων, καὶ τοῦ Γυμνασίου τοῦ Πηλίου Ὄρους: Fondation de la Société des Amis des Muses à Athènes, et du Gymnase du Mont-Pelion*. 4. A paper, published in the German language, and written by a native of Greece, which contains a short statement of the measures taken to promote the instruction of the modern Grecians, and an appeal to the Germans to support these exertions. 5. The address of Professor Thiersch to the Greeks, *Ἀνακήρυξις εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας*, which has been before mentioned. Some particulars were gleaned from an article in Millin's *Magazin Encyclopédique*, for the year 1815, vol. 1. p. 309, entitled: *Coup d'œil sur l'état actuel des Ecoles de la Grèce*. The account which appeared in the Göttingen Literary Review, (*Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*) Sept. 11, 1815, No. 145, and which afterwards was translated into French, in the *Bibliothèque Universelle*, was written by myself.

REMARKS

On a Hieroglyphic which Dr. Clarke terms a Horse's Head.

It has been a general remark, that a division in mental, is as necessary as in mechanical, labor; and nothing has established the necessity with greater force in my mind, than the failure of Dr. Clarke in the explanation of Egyptian symbols. It would appear indeed that the tasteful and classical acumen, which never for a moment fails him in investigating the relics of Greece, no longer directed his research amidst the monuments of Egypt. At all events, the archetypal rudiments of Grecian art, the matrix in which its embryo lineaments were formed, deserved from the idolater of that art a more elaborate and reverential investigation. A careless illustration of some of the hieroglyphics particularly struck me, and in cases, too, where explanatory authorities, I should have imagined, would present themselves to the recollection of the scholar. Hasty and rash decision upon one of these, is the subject of my present letter. I allude to a figure which Dr. Clarke calls a horse's head, engraved upon a stone, and which he thence presumes to be an amulet. Now with the latter supposition I have no quarrel; because engraven stones, it is well known, were by most of the oriental nations employed as talismans; and of this description were the stones upon the breast of the Jewish High Priest. But to affirm that the figure is a horse's head, argues, in my opinion, either a strong obliquity of vision, or great power of fancy. Few, I think, having no bias of theory in their minds, would admit the resemblance. The only excuse I can offer for the Doctor's optical mistake is, that all which concerned his favorite Ceres, had an undue influence on his judgment: and that the 'horse's head' which was one of the attributes of Despoina, or the Lady, haunted the imagination of her champion and liberator.

It is not, indeed, wonderful, that the particular turn of his Grecian enquiry may have warped his critical perception, which in general is sufficiently straightforward. But, I believe, no one as yet ever heard of a horse's head in Egypt serving for a talisman; nor do I believe, that amidst all the animal head-dresses of the Egyptians, any one can be pointed out with a horse's head. And it is the more singular, because we know, that in the cognate religion of Mythra, a horse was certainly dedi-

cated to the mediatorial divinity. But in the figure before us it is only necessary to use one's eye-sight, to decide that it is no horse's head, nor can any mode of position pervert the symbol so egregiously. The Egyptians, whatever may be said generally of their sculpture, were not inaccurate delineators; and though they sometimes substituted characters of compact, for characters of imitation, they never traced the outlines of an animal, with so preposterous a deviation from truth. The arbitrary sign was kept disjunct from the imitative; the two modes of symbolical writing would not admit of an amalgamation destructive to the features and the purposes of both. Perhaps a little more attention to the distinct classes of Hieroglyphical writing would have prevented a lapse into this unlucky error.

The symbol in question is very frequent among the Hieroglyphics. Though badly drawn by Denon, it occupies the centre of a circle on the Tentyrian Planisphere; it is on two of the mummies in the Museum; it is the most conspicuous of all the objects on the "Lover's fountain," where two of these figures are suspended over the sacred stable of Apis. To me the figure appears connected with the deepest Egyptian mysteries. But this is conjecture: I come to fact. The type is a quadruple combination; and consists of an *eye*, united to a *tongue*, surmounted by a ship's prow, and having a *devolved curtain* or *veil* subjoined. There is no begging the question in this assertion: we need not refer to Kircher or Proclus, for proof that combined Hieroglyphics in picture language were analogous to compound words in alphabetical; whatever was the mode in which the Hieroglyphics were read, whether discursively, as Proclus avers, each image furnishing its train of thought; or connectedly with grammatical indications, which is the common opinion, eye-sight is sufficient to convince us that the same symbols are occasionally conjoined or disjunct; and that, in consequence, a similar process has been resorted to, as that which is manifest in the formation of compound characters among the Chinese.

This being premised, what can be more evident, than the meaning of the compound figure in question? Need I elucidate the beautiful præcept it conveys? It may be explained by one of the laws of Pythagoras: "*Speak not of the mysteries without a directing light.*" Viewed thus, the figure is at once a præcept, and as Proclus intimates, a text; while, like the Chinese characters, it may have possessed one simple sound, and one decomposed idea; such as, perhaps, the *Initiatory silence*. On this, however, some argument may be maintained; but on the separate meaning of the combined characters, little or none. An

eye represented the mind, or the intellectual light. By an eye and a tongue, (a combined portion of the figure too evident to escape attention) Horus Apollo avers that the Egyptians indicated *discourse*; the eye representing the mind or agent, and the tongue the instrument. Implying the governing *νοῦς*, an eye was variously combined, sometimes with a sceptre, sometimes with a prow, at others with a globe, in all which the meaning is obvious. Joined to *two arms*, it portrayed the active interposition of the governing mind; and corresponds with a phrase of the Rabbis, the *two arms* of God.

The *eye*, the *prow*, and the *tongue*, are clear in the figure, and I think their meaning is indisputable; but the figure of the VOLUTE attached requires a few words.

That the volute infers something involved, or a mystery, the analogy of language seems to imply—it is a sign of evolution or involution, according to its position, among arithmeticians at this day. That the figure was mysterious and sacred, is proved by the cult of the Barbarian, and the lituus of the Augur. Now, if reasoning by analogy and assuming the crescent sursum and deorsum as a clue, I infer that the upward volute meant mystery or involution, and the downward evolution or revelation, as in arithmetic, I think I am not encroaching too far, on my assumed position, by understanding the volute in the figure as a revealed mystery.

What indeed could better express the rolling up or withdrawing of a veil than the figure in question? There is, indeed, a curious coincidence to support this supposition. The word *mistor*, from whence the mysteries are derived, implies in Coptic, a veil. The veil of the temple, which concealed the Holy of Holies, is familiar to Biblical readers. To remove the veil, thence became synonymous with a revelation. In this sense Zechariah uses it; and no doubt the *rending* of the *veil* during our Lord's passion, was meant to symbolise a *universal revelation made by an act of violence*.

The character, in this combination, therefore seems to imply, a veil drawn up, or a mystery evolved—simply, a revelation.

The conjecture is further supported by accessible representations. On the Fountain of Lovers, there are two of these figures, called by D. Clarke horses' heads, from which the folds I have described devolve on both sides, like the drapery of a curtain. Behind appears the sacred stable of Apis, perhaps the object of revelation, as we know it occupied the adytum of his temple. And that some mystery was connected with it, is evident from this; that the bars of his stall are manifestly arranged

in mystic order: such as might be expected from devotees to the sacred theory of numbers.

Finally, that the conjoint symbol was a figure, connected with, and perhaps represented and explained in, the mysteries, is corroborated by another representation.

There is a plate in Denon where, surrounded by a circle, and placed upon a sceptre, it forms the terminating point of a flight of fourteen steps (a mystic number) to which a procession of as many priests is directing its approach. It is placed exactly as if to imply, that it is the grand object of the procession: and the figure of the *Hierophant* Hermes, known by his Ibis head, waiting its arrival, indicates beyond dispute an Initiation.

That connected with this indication and with the sceptre and globe, it may possess another meaning than that which I have assigned, I shall not dispute. New combinations of figure produced, without doubt, a different interpretation. Besides, the signs themselves were cabalistical; that is, they involved variety of meaning, according as the analysis was theological, philosophical, or physical.

I shall not therefore object to those, who may discover the Egyptian trinity in the object of this initiation, referring the helm-surmounted eye, to the governing mind, the tongue to wisdom or the Logos, and the volute to the universal soul or Binah of the Jews.

Should these remarks correspond with the general tenor of your Classical miscellany, I will enter more fully on that interesting, but hitherto unproductive, field of speculation, the Hieroglyphical Language.

CLERONOMUS.

PLATONIC DEMONSTRATION OF THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL,

PART I.

PLATO has demonstrated the immortality of the rational soul in three of his dialogues, viz. in the *Phædo*,¹ in the 10th book

¹ There are five arguments in the *Phædo* for the immortality of the soul, the fifth of which properly and fully demonstrates it from the essence of the soul. See the notes to my translation of that dialogue.

of his Republic, and in the Phædrus. But though the arguments employed by him in each of these dialogues, in proof of this most important truth, will be found to possess, by those that understand them, incontrovertible evidence; yet, it appears to me that this is peculiarly the case with the reasoning in the Phædrus, which is not only, in the language of Plato, accompanied by geometrical necessities, but is at once admirably subtle and singularly sublime.

As this reasoning is most perspicuously developed by the Platonic Hermias in his Scholia on the Phædrus, I shall give a translation of his elucidations, and also of the text of Plato, on which these elucidations are a comment. The words of Plato are as follow :

“ Every soul is immortal : for that which is always moved is immortal. But that which moves another thing, and is moved by another, in consequence of having a cessation of motion, has also a cessation of life. Hence that alone which moves itself, because it does not desert itself, never ceases to be moved ; but this is also the fountain and principle of motion, to such other things as are moved. But principle is unbegotten. For it is necessary that every thing which is generated, should be generated from a principle, but that the principle itself should not be generated from any one thing. For if it were generated from a certain thing, it would not be generated from principle. Since, therefore, it is unbegotten, it is also necessary that it should be incorruptible. For the principle being destroyed, it could neither itself be generated from another thing, nor another thing be generated from it, since it is necessary that all things should be generated from principle. Hence, the principle of motion is that which moves itself : and this can neither be destroyed, nor generated. For otherwise, all heaven and all generation falling together must stop, and would never again have any thing, from whence being moved, they would be generated. Since then it appears, that the nature which is moved by itself is immortal, he who asserts that this is the essence and definition of soul, will have no occasion to blush. For every body, to which motion externally accedes, is inanimate. But that to which motion is inherent from itself, is animated ; as if this were the very nature of soul. If this however be the case, and there is nothing else which moves itself except soul, it necessarily follows that soul is unbegotten and immortal.”

The following are the elucidations of Hermias :

“ In the first place, it must be inquired about what kind of soul Plato is speaking. For some, among which is the Stoic Po-

sidonius, are of opinion that it is alone about the soul of the world, because it is said *πασα*, and it is added a little after, 'all heaven and all generation falling together must stop.' But others say, that is simply concerning every soul, so as to include the soul of an ant, and a fly. And this was the opinion of Harpocration. For he understands the word *πασα*, as pertaining to every soul. If however, it be requisite neither to restrict the problem, nor to extend it simply to all-animals, we must assume from Plato himself, what kind of soul it is, of which he is now speaking. He says therefore, that it is necessary in the first place to speak about the nature of soul both the divine and the human, i. e. about every rational soul; so that the present discourse is concerning the rational soul. To which we may add, that the ancients are accustomed to call the rational soul, that which is properly soul. For they call that which is above it, intellect, and that which is beneath it, not simply soul, but the irrational life, or the animation of the spirit, the life which is distributed about bodies, and the like. But they denominated the rational part that which is properly soul. For Plato also calls the rational soul, that which is properly man. He previously, however, enunciates the conclusion, since he is about to make the demonstrations, from things which are essentially inherent in the soul, and which pertain to it, so far as it is soul. On this account therefore, he first enunciates the conclusion, indicating by so doing that the *διότι*, or the *why*, is contractedly comprehended in the *οτι*,¹ or the *that*. For the soul possesses the immortal from its essence. Hence, prior to the evolved, divided, and expanded demonstration, he gives the contracted and that which contains the *why* together with the *that*.² But there are here, two demonstrative syllogisms, through which the immortality of the soul is demonstrated, and which directly prove that it is so; and there is also another syllogism which demonstrates this, through a deduction to an impossibility. Why, however, is there this number of syllogisms? For the intention of Plato, was not simply to adduce a multitude of arguments, since in this case he would have employed many others, as he does in the *Phædo*; but he employs such as are adapted to each subject of discussion. For now, as we have already observed, he adduces arguments derived from the essence of the soul, and from things which are essentially inherent in it. In answer to this it must be said, that since it is proposed to demonstrate that the soul is

¹ For *τιν οντι* here, it is necessary to read *τιν οτι*.

² The same reading as the above, must also be adopted here.

immortal, if we see how many modes there are of corruption, and show that the soul is not corrupted according to any one of these, we shall then have demonstrated that it is incorruptible and indestructible, and it will also be evident that it is immortal. For every thing that is corrupted, is corrupted in a twofold respect. For either it is itself corrupted by itself, through the matter which it contains, or it is corrupted externally. Thus for instance wood, by alone lying on the ground, is corrupted through the putrefaction which is in itself: for it contains in itself the cause of its corruption; as Plato also says in the Republic, that every thing which is corrupted, is corrupted by its own appropriate evil. But it may also be corrupted externally, by being burnt, and cut. Since, therefore, there are two modes of corruption, on this account Plato adduces two syllogisms. For one of these demonstrates, that the soul is not corrupted by itself, which he shows through its being self-moved and perpetually moved; but the other syllogism demonstrates that neither is the soul corrupted by any thing else, which he shows through its being the principle of motion.

Shall we say, therefore, that each of these syllogisms is imperfect, but that the demonstration derives perfection from both? Or shall we say, that in either of them the other is comprehended, but that the peculiarity of each, previously presents itself to the view? For that which is not corrupted by itself, cannot be corrupted by another thing. For having itself in itself, the cause of preserving itself, and always being present with itself, how can it be corrupted by any thing else? For that which is self-motive is a thing of this kind, as will be demonstrated. And how can that which is not corrupted by another thing, but is the principle and cause of other things being preserved, be corrupted by itself? For the principle of motion will be demonstrated to be a thing of this kind. For neither will it be corrupted by the things which are above it, since it is preserved by them, nor by the things posterior to itself, since it is the cause of their being and life. If, therefore, it cannot be corrupted by any thing, how, since it is the fountain of life, can it be corrupted by itself? Hence, as we have said, each of the arguments is of itself perfect, and comprehends in itself the other. But one of them shows, and is characterized by this, that the soul is not corrupted by itself; and the other by this, that the soul is not corrupted by any other thing. Let us however, in the first place, arrange the prepositions of the syllogisms, and afterwards consider the development of them.

The first syllogism therefore, is as follows: The soul is self-moved. That which is self-moved is perpetually moved.

That which is perpetually moved is immortal. The soul, therefore, is immortal. Hence this reasoning shows us that the soul is not corrupted by itself. But the second syllogism is, the soul is self-moved. That which is self moved is the principle of motion. The principle of motion is unbegotten. The unbegotten is incorruptible. The incorruptible is immortal. The soul, therefore, is immortal. And this reasoning demonstrates to us that the soul is not corrupted by a certain other thing. The truth of the assumptions, therefore, we shall accurately discuss in what follows. • But now considering the first and common proposition of the two syllogisms by itself, that the soul is self-moved, and which Plato arranges in the last place of the whole reasoning, let us survey how that which is self-moved is the first of things that are moved, especially since no casual man doubts concerning the existence of the self-motive essence. And perhaps it will be found that the philosophers do not dissent from each other. For Aristotle indeed takes away all corporeal motions from the soul, which we also say is most true. But Plato clearly shows that the motions of the soul are different from all the corporeal motions. For he says in the 10th book of the *Laws*, “that soul conducts every thing in the heavens, the earth, and the sea, by its motions, the names of which are *to will, to consider, to attend providentially to other things, to consult, to opine rightly and falsely, together with rejoicing, grieving, daring, fearing, hating and loving.*” That there is, therefore, a certain principle of motion, and that it is that which is self-moved, will be from hence evident. For as it is manifest that there is that which is alter-motive, this will either be moved by another alter-motive nature, and that by another, and so on to infinity; or alter-motive natures will move each other in a circle, so that the first will again be moved by the last; or, if it is not possible that either of these modes can take place, it is necessary that the self-motive nature must have the precedence. It is evident, therefore, that motive natures cannot proceed to infinity: for neither is there the infinite in essence, nor is there any science of infinites. But neither is it possible for motive natures to be in a circle. For the order of beings would be subverted, and the same thing would be both cause and effect; so that it is necessary there should be a certain principle of motion, and that motion should neither be to infinity, nor in a circle. This principle of motion, however, which, according to both the philosophers, is soul, Plato says is self-moved, but Aristotle immovable.

¹ i. e. Aristotle.

But that it is necessary this principle of motion should be demonstrated to be self-moved, even from the dogmas of Aristotle, you may learn from hence. In all beings nature does not proceed without a medium from a contrary to a contrary, as, for instance, from winter to summer ; but it is entirely requisite that a medium should precede, at one time spring, and at another time autumn ; and the like takes place in all bodies and incorporeal essences. Here, likewise, as there is the alter-motive and the immovable nature, it is necessary there should be a medium which is the self-moved essence, being one and the same in number, and in subject. For that which Aristotle calls the self-moved nature, as, for instance, the animal, is not that which is now proposed for investigation. For the animal, according to him, being composed of the immovable and the alter-motive, he says that the whole is self-moved. So that, as there is that which is entirely immovable, such, for instance, as the principle of all things, and as there is that which is alter-motive, such as bodies, there will be between them the self-moved nature, which will be nothing else than soul. For that which we see moved by it, this we say is animated, so that this is the very nature of soul, itself to move itself. There are, therefore, these three things according to Aristotle, viz. intellect, life, and being ; and in the first place, that we may speak of being, as there is something which is generated from another thing and which receives existence from another, there is also that which imparts existence to itself, such as the heaven and intellects, which he says always exist unbegotten by any other cause. For, according to him they are neither generated by a cause, as neither are they generated in time, but they are always unbegotten, and the causes of existence to themselves. And again, in life there is that which receives life from other things, for man generates man ; and there are also things which have life from themselves, such as again, the heaven and intellect. For they have not an *adscititious*, but a *connascent* life. Farther still, as there are things which receive from others the power of intellectual perception, and become through them intellective, as the intellect which is in capacity, according to Aristotle, there is also intellect which is in energy, which possesses from itself intellectual perception, and intellectually perceives itself. ^{*} Hence from all this it follows, that as there is

^{*} And this intellect in energy is the medium between the intelligible, properly so called, which is superior to intellect, and the intellect which is in capacity.

that which is moved by another thing, there is also necessarily that which is the cause to itself of being moved, and imparts self-motion to itself. For, otherwise, it would be absurd to pass entirely from the alter-motive to the immovable without assuming that which is self-moved as the medium, in the same manner as it is absurd to pass from that which is generated, and which only sometimes exists, to that which is super-essential non-being, without assuming being as the medium. For it will be immanifest what kind of non-being we assume, whether that which is inferior to a generated nature, or that which is superior to it, unless we assume the intermediate nature, which is eternal being. Thus, likewise, in motion, it will be immanifest, what kind of the immovable we assume, whether that which is subordinate, or that which is superior to the alter-motive nature, unless the self-moved is assumed as a medium. And the like takes place in life, intellect, and other things.

This self-motive motion, therefore, is demonstrated by the philosopher in the Laws, to be the first principle of all other motions, and the cause of them according to all the significations of cause. For it is the effective, the paradigmatic, and the final cause of them, which are alone properly causes. For the formal cause is in the effect, and is the effect itself. And the material cause is much more remote from being properly cause; since it has the relation of things without which others are not effected.¹ Hence, that the self-moved nature is the effective cause of other motions is evident, as Plato demonstrates in the Laws. "For if all things, says he, should stand still, what would that be which would be first moved?" Is it not evident that it must be the self-moved nature? For if that which accedes to the motive cause is moved, and all other beings are alter-motive,² but that which is self-motive possesses in itself a motive power, and does not merely approximate to it, but is united to it, or rather, has motion for its essence, it is evident that this, being first moved, will move other things. For as, if the sun did not set and rise, but was immovable, we should be dubious what is the cause of so great a light, and if he were invisible to the things which he illuminates, we should be still more dubious; thus also, with respect to the soul, since being incorporeal it is the cause of all motions, it occasions us to doubt how this is effected. As, therefore, the sun who illuminates all

¹ Because it is that *from which* or *in which*, other things are effected.

² This is on the supposition that all things stand still.

things, much more makes himself luminous, thus, likewise, the soul, which moves all things by a much greater priority, moves itself. For every cause begins its energy from itself; and you will find that the motions of the soul are the paradigms of corporeal motions.

Let us then assume the corporeal motions; but these are eight in number, being rather passive than effective; viz. *generation, corruption, increase, diminution, lation, circulation, mixture, and separation*. In the soul, therefore, there is increase, when giving itself to more excellent natures it multiplies its intellects. But there is then corruption in it; when departing from thence it becomes more imbecile, and more sluggish in its intellectual perceptions. Again, generation takes place in it when it ascends from this terrene abode.¹ But the corruption of it is its last lapse from the intelligible. And mixture, indeed, in it, is collected intelligence, and at the same time the contemplation of forms. But separation in it may be said to be a more partial intelligence, and the contemplation of one form only. Again, lation in the soul is the motion of it according to a right line, and into the realms of generation. But circulation in it is its periodic revolution about forms, its evolution, and its restitution to the same condition. Circulation, therefore, may be more appropriately assigned to divine souls, but lation to ours. You may also perceive in divine souls both these motions. For the Demiurgus, says Plato in the *Timæus*, taking two right lines, bent them into a circle. Hence it is evident that the circular inflection and intelligence of souls is not without the right line. For it pertains to intellect alone to be purely moved in a circle. But the ninth motion, which is that of incorporeal natures about bodies, such as calefactions, or refrigerations, or animations, has a paradigmatic cause in the soul, so far as the soul gives life to bodies.

And thus we have sufficiently shown that there are motions of souls, which are the paradigms of corporeal motions. It remains, therefore, to demonstrate that the motions of the soul are the final causes of other motions.² For immortality is not pre-

¹ For this is, as it were, a new birth of the soul.

² The demonstration of this is wanting in the original. For in the original after *λειπεται δὲ καὶ τελικὰς αὐτὰς ἀποδιξάει*, there immediately follows *ἐπειδὴ καὶ ὁ σπουδαῖος ἐνταυθα καὶ ἡμῶν ἀνὴρ πρὸς τὸ αὐτοῦ χρησόμεν καὶ διότι*, which evidently implies that something preceding is wanting. And it is obvious from the translation of what follows, that there is no demonstration of the motions of the soul being the final causes of other mo-

licated of the soul, as a certain other thing, but is co-essentialised in the very essence of it, and unically comprehends the whole demonstration. For immortality is a certain life in the same manner as self-motion. Plato, therefore, afterwards adduces an evolved and expanded demonstration, when he says, "*for that which is always moved is immortal*," &c. omitting to say that the soul is self-moved, as being common to the two syllogisms, and intending to introduce it as the last of the four arguments, where also we may more accurately investigate it. Now, however, prior to the discussion of the parts of the first arguments, let us logically adapt the words themselves of Plato to the propositions.

All the propositions, therefore, of the syllogisms are three. The soul is self-moved: the self-moved is always moved: that which is always moved is immortal. But as we have said, the first and smallest of all the propositions, which says the soul is self-moved, is ranked as the last. For the third and greatest of all of them is placed first, as being connective of the whole reasoning; and this is that in which Plato says, "*for that which is always moved is immortal*." But the proposition posterior to this, which says, that which is self-moved is always moved, is introduced through the contrary, the alter-motive, together with demonstration. For Plato here says: "*But that which moves another thing, and is moved by another*," i. e. the alter-motive nature, "*in consequence of having a cessation of motion*," i. e. not being always moved, "*has also a cessation of life*," i. e. is not immortal. If, therefore, that which is moved by another, in consequence of not being always moved, is not immortal, that which is self-moved, being always moved, is immortal. All the propositions, however, are assumed essentially, and so far as each of them is that which it is. For from that which is moved by another, it is not only demonstrated that the self-moved is always moved, but also that the always-moved is self-moved; so that they convert, as for instance, the self-moved is always moved, and the always-moved is self-moved. For if that which is moved by another has a cessation of motion, i. e. if the alter-motive is not always-moved, it will be evident that the always-moved is self-moved. For this is collected by the second hypothetical syllogism. For if the alter-motive is not always-moved,

tions. It may, however, be summarily shown as follows, that the motions of the soul are the final causes of other motions. The motions of the soul are, as has been demonstrated, the effective causes of other motions. Every thing desires good. Good is proximately imparted.

it is evident that the always-moved is not alter-motive. But that which is not alter-motive is self-motive. And from the words, "*because it does not desert itself*," it is collected, that every thing which is always-moved is self-moved. For if the alter-motive is likewise always-moved, it is in consequence of subsisting in conjunction with the motive cause. Much more, therefore, will that which is self-moved be always-moved, because it is not only always present with itself, but is united to itself.

T.

ON THE ORIGIN OF THE DRAMA.

THE Origin of the Drama has been assigned to various periods and various causes; but, as it would seem, without such definite precision of inference and such force of evidence, as are necessary to make it no longer a question. In tracing the drama to the mysteries, I should perhaps be wrong to presume on any striking originality, but, I may venture to say that, although this mode of accounting for the origin of the stage may have been previously broached as a surmise, it has hitherto never assumed the mature form of a regular hypothesis.

We have very few glimmerings of light to direct our search for the origin of the drama in Greece. All that we collect with any certainty is, that it was introduced originally to the public under a very inartificial and inelegant form, and that a perambulating stage, in no degree better than similar contrivances of our tumblers and mountebanks, was the humble cradle in which Melpomene and Thalia first made their appearance before the Grecian world.

Nevertheless there is reason for pronouncing, on a slight examination of their features, however disguised by so unworthy a garb, that the same superstition which fabricated the Pagan mythology was their parent, and that the Pagan Hierarchy was the Lucina who presided at their birth. It appears, indeed, that the abuses of the original comedy, or rather farce (for in its original state it resembled more what we have since designated by that name), were of a very undignified complexion. The gestures and actions of the bye-standers were mimicked with the grossest caricature, and their lives and characters laid open to the lash of scorn with the most unsparing scurrility. Now it is well known that the particular branch of Poetry called

Satire took its origin from this sarcastic licence, and that satire, both by name and character, is fairly traceable to Bacchanalian and Saturnalian rites. Here then is a strong presumptive proof of religious origin: but it is necessary to trace the connexion deeper. It was in the nature of the rites I have alluded to, particularly the Saturnalian, to prescribe a state of brotherhood or equality among the initiated. The licence of language was permitted as the proof and result of that equality; and the custom has descended to the Carnivals of Italy. During the Eleusinian Mysteries a performance still more curiously in point occurred; that of a scurrilous and obscene dialogue between two of the acting characters, Ceres and Bembo. The procession, also, in setting forth from Athens, was indulged in indiscriminate abuse of those whom it passed: and the same thing seems to have occurred in the Isiac processions, from which the Eleusinian were certainly derived.

Here, then, in this scurrilous dialogue, and the accompanying choruses of the devotees, we have the elements of the original comedy.

With regard to the higher walk of the ancient drama, tragedy, its very name, (the song of the goat) clearly connects its origin with the same rites from whence the cognate appellation of satire is derived. It principally occupied itself with the splendid fictions of the Pagan mythology, disdained the employment of lower beings than deities or deified heroes, and introduced choruses commenting and moralising on the succeeding events of the action, with an austere grandeur which resembles the effect of Church music in the solemn pauses of the service. Even the apparent unnecessary length to which they are prolonged possesses something of a religious character; it seems to infer that morality of effect is more considered than the gratification of the sight or the taste. The chorus, in short, constitutes the discourse, to which the events of the drama compose a kind of pictorial text.

The actors, on these occasions, scrupulously adhered to certain prescribed *signs of caste*, by no means indispensable to dramatic effect. Of these the sock and buskin are the most familiar; but the masks most deserving of attention. The effect of these last, indeed, appears so ill calculated for the success of either comic or tragic performances, as to create no little wonder, how a refined people could be induced to tolerate so senseless a deformity. Certainly any attempt to ally such hideous excrescences which, besides disfiguring the face, and neutralising the physiognomy of passion, imparted a *sepulchral*

cadence to the voice, with modern comedy or tragedy, would in a great measure annul the illusive magic of Shakspeare himself. All that could be said in favor of this custom was, that it was sanctioned by the antiquity of its origin. Aristotle confesses, that the period of its introduction was unknown. There is no alternative, then, but to conclude, that it was a custom originally prescribed by the religious rites of Paganism. To no less authority would the delicate taste of Greece have so zealously immolated its nice discrimination.

All these circumstances combined make out a strong presumptive case in favor of the religious origin of the drama.

But, in order to consolidate the proof, and to connect the drama by an unbroken chain with the Pagan mysteries, it will be necessary to inquire what those mysteries were, and to place them before the eye in as clear and concentrated a position as the authorities which refer to them will allow. In order to epitomise the inquiry, and collect the scattered rays of description into one focus, I shall begin by assuming, what few I believe, will now object to, that the mysteries of Greece were a copy of the Egyptian, and that the rites of Osiris were the same as those of the same deity among the Magians, characterised as he was by a name which has been proved to be radically similar.¹

The most striking circumstance about these mysteries is, that in them were represented DRAMAS, PANTOMIMES and MASKS, founded upon mythological stories. The chief fund for these representations in Egypt was the popular story of Osiris murdered by his brother Typhon. According to Plutarch the search of Isis was the subject of superb pageants and water spectacles; and in truth the whole narration, concluding with the triumph of Horus, is by no means ill calculated for dramatic effect. A similar representation of the story of Ceres took place during the Eleusinian mysteries.² It would appear also that on the same occasion four priests, dressed in a particular costume derived from Egypt, performed a kind of mask in the characters of Jupiter, Mercury, Apollo and Ceres; an allegory which conveyed instruction to the aspirant. Sometimes the creation of the world was represented, the cause of death accounted for,

¹ Mizra, that is, Osiris with m derivative, agrees nearly with Mithra.

² And among the Druids devoted to Cendven (the lady of corn), Davies' Mythology. Nor is it unlikely that the sacred amphitheatre of Stonehenge was occasionally the site of these dramas. The Edda abounds with fictions well calculated for dramatic pageantry. Freya, weeping and searching for her husband, is the story of Venus and Isis in another dress.

the lapse of the soul described and its restoration portrayed. To this class of masks indubitably belongs the beautiful story of Cupid and Psyche, described by Apuleius during his account of initiation; and it is not a little singular, that it is an inexhaustible source of the most beautiful operas and masks to the present time. While these scenes were representing the mystagogue performed the part of the explanatory chorus; but on some occasions, as in the search of Ceres, a chorus accompanied the action. Symbols were presented to the aspirant, and a mysterious dialogue was introduced, followed by an explanatory lecture. A splendid pageant of Gods and Goddesses passed over the stage, and the king of the mysteries sung a hymn supposed to be composed by Orpheus, describing their generation and performances. We are also told that he concluded by a palinody or recantation, denying their existence, and proclaiming only one god.

All these things were derived by the Greeks from the Egyptian priesthood. Among a body of men so crafty and so skilful, so versed in natural magic, and so famous for jugglery and delusion, it is natural to suppose that their religious melodramas were clothed with extraordinary pomp, and produced astonishing effects upon the senses. Perhaps the heroic descents into hell, which have furnished poetry with its grandest machinery, are traceable to these exhibitions.

With regard to those of Eleusis, which can be considered in no other light than as copies from these originals, there is sufficient evidence, without going the length of Warburton, or assuming that Virgil's 6th Book is a detail of the initiatory drama, to establish the point that the performance was of the most stupendous and admirable description.

In the first place, the THEATRE (for so it is curiously called) of these dramatic pageants was capable of holding 80,000 spectators. Aristides calls it a "kind of Temple of the whole earth, and of all that man beholds, performed in the most dreadful or exhilarating manner. In what other place have the records of fable sung, of things more marvellous; or in what region upon earth have the objects presented to the eye borne a more exact resemblance to the sounds which strike the ear? What objects of sight have the numberless generations of men and women beheld comparable to those exhibited in the ineffable mysteries?" Pletho says that "*frightful and shocking apparitions, in a variety of forms, were displayed to the mystæ; and that thunder and lightning, and fire, and every thing portentous, was introduced.*" "Towards the end of the celebration," says Stobæus, "the

whole scene is terrible : all is trembling, shuddering, heat, and astonishment. Many horrible spectres are seen, and strange cries and howlings uttered. Light succeeds darkness ; and again the blackest darkness the most glaring light ; then open lawns appear, flowery meads and waving groves : *dances* and *choruses* are seen there, and various holy phantasies enchant the sight. Melodious notes are heard from far, mingling with the loftier symphonies of sacred hymns."

These quotations, thus combined, afford an idea of the scenery and mechanism attached to the mysteries of Eleusis. Nor were the dramas exhibited in the caves of the magi of a less magnificent character. A fertile source of the sublime and wonderful was supplied by the cosmogony of Zoroaster, and the contests of good and evil genii. But if we may trust to Porphyry, there was another feature about these oriental representations, the introduction of astronomy. Indeed, it appears that something like a celestial orrery, accompanied by sacred music and explanatory lectures, was exhibited by the magians to their novices. Something of the same kind may be presumed to have composed the *antopsis*, or last stage of initiation of Eleusis ; for Apuleius says that after passing through darkness, the wreck of elements, and every species of horror, he arrived on the threshold of Proserpine's temple, and beheld a midnight Sun shining with the splendor of noon day. The inference is less doubtful with regard to the scenery exhibited in the cave of Trophonius : that was evidently of an astronomical character, and supposes the utmost perfection of scenic mechanism. Stars ascended and descended, happy islands were discovered afar, gulphs boiling with vapors, and cataracts, and rivers of fire.

Judging, therefore, from all these circumstances, we may safely pronounce, that the Pagan mysteries, in various countries, actually contain the germ of every species of stage performance which has descended to the present day ; masks, pantomime, ballet, farce, and the legitimate drama. Thus the question seems naturally to end here : but there are a variety of little corroborating circumstances, of a less generalising nature, which will place the result beyond all doubt. "

We have seen that Tragedy, in its original construction, differed in nothing from the choral hymns in honor of Bacchus or Pan, with an occasional monologue to break the uniformity ; that the dramatis personæ of gods and heroes are the same as those exhibited in the secret rites. The first actors were therefore, in all probability, an order of priests, as they were at the revival of the stage. Comedy and Tragedy were distinguished by certain

emblems which partake of a pontifical character. The first by the sock, which was a peculiar kind of low shoe laced above the ankle; the last by the buskin, which was a species of quadrangular boot profusely decorated, but very ungraceful, with a high sole, and fastened beneath the knee. Now, it is curious, that the priests of Egypt, during the course of particular rites, assumed a particular kind of shoe. Much indeed cannot be extracted from this meagre fact; but I am strongly inclined to suspect that the buskin, which was peculiar to hunters¹ as well as tragedians, is connected with the mysteries; for the priests on some occasions assumed the garb of *huntsmen*, and a mimic hunt was represented. However this may be, another symbol appropriated by the ancient drama, the mask, proves beyond a doubt its origin from the sacred rites. I have before stated reasons for believing their use tolerated only by superstitious prescription. The fact is that we have the strongest proof possible that masks were worn by the actors of the mysteries. We have extant representations of the masks worn by the Egyptians: we have the evidence of Terfullian, that the priests of Mithras wore masks after the Egyptian fashion: we have the authority of Eusebius for assuming that the four actors in the drama of the Cosmogony at Eleusis—Jupiter, Apollo, Ceres, Mercury, wore the symbols of the same deities in Egyptian rites. In short we have extant the figures of those four actors, masked as they were in the rites of Serapis, on a variety of monuments. This inference, too, in a great degree explains the reason of the sepulchral look and sepulchral tone, given purposely to the tragic mask. The characters represented in the mysteries were most probably evoked before the initiate as ghosts inhabiting the lower world. They appeared perhaps before him and recited their history, as they did in the original Tragedies, and as they do to Ulysses in Homer's book of Necromancy, which has equal title with Virgil's account to be considered as a description of the most ancient initiation: perhaps of Cyclopean institution.

Another circumstance which tends to the same result, is that

¹ It is curious that, during the mysteries attached to the African secret tribunal called Purrah, and evidently derived from Egypt, men with masks officiate, apparitions are evoked, dramas performed, and hunts represented. Thus the extraordinary square hunting boots, worn by the Sierra Leone chiefs, may be connected with the buskin. The temples of this curious association are like those of the Druids, composed of circular rows of trees, lopped into the shape of columns, with a square altar in the midst.

a mysterious and sacred dance, called Emmelia, was introduced into the original tragedy, which was beyond a doubt derived from dances peculiar to religious rites, and which Plato approves, as conducive to a love of virtue and an abhorrence of vice. On the same principle, serious *ballets* may be traced to the same source.

That masks and pantomimes are traceable to the mysteries, may be inferred from their allegorical characteristics. Spencer and Bunyan show in what manner the first may be made to serve the purposes of morality and religion. With regard to the last Dr. Clarke has not only argued the point with his wonted ingenuity, but has exhibited a very curious pictorial proof of it, taken from a sepulchral vase. (*Travels through Greece, &c.*) The Italian harlequinade is evidently, as he infers, a different version of Cupid and Psyche, and similar allegorical stories represented in the mysteries. Columbine is the wandering soul, harlequin the pursuinglover, the pantaloon¹ her tyrannical father, and the scurra or buffoon, as he thinks, Momus, but as I imagine, Mercury, who is frequently introduced in that character. The picture he exhibits proves this, and farther, that such pantomimes were exhibited in the Egyptian rites. For the characters are not Greek but Egyptian. The male figure on the left is dressed in the well known Egyptian pantaloon. He has on his head the symbol of Serapis, who, like Adonis, was represented in search of the lost soul, and Hermes was his appropriate attendant. The symbol which the latter holds is evidently an Egyptian, not a Greek Caduceus. What is most curious about this analysis of modern pantomime, which shows to what serious things trifling customs may be traced, is, that the four elementary characters which compose it are precisely those of the four actors in the Egyptian and Grecian mysteries—Jupiter, Mercury, Cupid or the torch bearer, and Proserpine, or the wandering soul.

Perhaps the circumstance which has contributed to perpetuate this popular fable under its present form is the masquerades of the Carnival. These are evidently relics of the ancient Saturnalia, and are only one of many proofs how far the court of Rome originally gave way to the force of Pagan prejudice. The character of this amusement, the scurrilous jests allowed—the masks—the favorite characters usually adopted—the unbounded mirth, agreeing with the licence of Syria and Egypt on the regenera-

¹ Goldoni has introduced the above characters into legitimate comedy with a very tiresome obedience to national prejudice.

tion of their deities, are curious proofs of the duration of ancient habit.¹

But there can be adduced a still more curious proof of this principle, as well as the hypothesis I am contending for : that the modern drama reappeared after its extinction, not only with the same form, the same objects, the same description of actors as the ancient ; but actually under the same primitive designation, that of *mysteries*. This fact is not only curious but strikingly corroborative of my positions : and this, whether we take for basis, that the human mind under the same circumstances uniformly pursues the same march, or whether we infer, as there is great reason to believe, that the Church of Rome availed itself of one of the most powerful weapons of Pagan theology.

Be this as it will, the modern French Drama, from which the English is derived, appeared in the reign of Charles the 5th in all its original simplicity, consisting of choral hymns to the Virgin and the Saints, to which in time episodes were added, and finally scriptural characters introduced. The actors composed a Friary, called Brothers of the Passion, from the subjects they performed ; and their plays were named *Chants Royaux*, or *mysteries*.

It is here worthy of remark, though few, I believe, are ignorant of the fact, that the noblest poem in our language, the *Paradise Lost*, was originally composed as a *dramatic mystery*. Indeed it is very capable in its present state of being decomposed and restored to its original form. So restored, it would in fact exhibit all the features of the most ancient mysterious drama, the Cosmogony, the lapse of man, the machines of good and evil spirits, the scenery of an Elysian garden, of the starry universe, of heaven and hell. It is not certain that any thing like this object entered into Milton's purview in writing it : though the mighty and beneficent purposes to which the stage is capable of being applied, could not have escaped his great and piercing mind. And he may have wished to re-apply it to its original purpose, as the gigantic lever of national religion and morality.

I cannot go the length of Darwin, of wishing to see a representation of the mystic shews of Eleusis reproduced upon our

¹ It has been supposed that Comedy took its origin from the happy denouement of Tragedy. There may be some foundation for this idea. It occurs to me that tragic scenes were performed during the ritual period of mourning for Bacchus, Osiris, Adonis, &c. and that Comedy had its source in the festivals, unbounded licence and joyful choruses consequent on their revival.

stage under the more ennobling features of our national religion. But I am inclined to think that a selection of sacred subjects might be performed during the periods of religious festivals, as the oratorios are during Lent, with public advantage as well as gratification. I would of course be understood to mean this under very punctilious restriction. The sacred Dramas of Hannah More, for instance, might perhaps on such occasions be advantageously performed. The subjects indeed, equally fitted for stage effect to be found in the same inestimable reservoir, are inexhaustible. The magnificence of oriental scenery is there united with all the wonderful of incident, all the sublime of supernatural agency, and all the beautiful of morality. C.

ANCIENT BRITISH LANGUAGE OF CORNWALL.

LETTER X.

CORNISH EXTRACTS.

HAVING in my former letters compared the Cornish with those languages, to which it bears the greatest affinity, and endeavoured to trace its phraseology under its several disguises, you will now expect that I should give you some account of the writings that are still extant in it. Unfortunately, its remains are few, scattered, and difficult to be procured; and, as compositions, possessed of little literary merit. The Cornish manuscripts are characterised as the works of men, who wrote to please a rude and illiterate people. What remains is mostly in verse, and is an inferior kind of sacred poetry. But it is foreign to our subject to enter into any examination of the sentiments, or to reprobate the absurdities which occur in those writers. Let us consider them merely as the vehicles in which the language is now preserved; and because they were composed while it was yet in common use, we may very properly suppose that they are pure, or in other words, that they represent it as it was then spoken. It is therefore in this point of view that those manuscripts are valuable. It is indeed on the examination and study of these, that the only possibility of examining the Cornish language depends.

I wish it had been so far in my power to inspect those venerable relics, so as to have given you such an account as would be mutually satisfactory. As it is, I can offer you but few original remarks,

and must, in a great measure, give you the substance of what has been said by others.

The most ancient Cornish manuscript is the Cottonian. It is supposed to be of the eleventh century. It is a vocabulary, which was mistaken at first for Welsh; but when examined by Mr. Lhuyd, the archæologist, he pronounced it to be Cornish. He thus speaks of it in a letter to his friend Mr. Tonkin. "I know not whether I mentioned that I had sent Mr. Moor a copy of an old Cornish glossary in the Cotton library. It is a valuable curiosity; being probably seven or eight hundred years old. If you cannot procure it, you shall have a copy of mine: alphabetically, or in the order of the Cotton MS. which is in continued lines, but with some regard to natural order." (Polwhele's Hist. of Corn. vol. iii. p. 32.) Dr. Borlase has incorporated it in the vocabulary at the end of his Antiquities of Cornwall.

There are two manuscript poems in Cornish, which have been preserved in the Bodleian library.¹ They were dramatic, and are such as might have been expected to be produced about the fifteenth century, among a people little acquainted with literature. The mysteries of religion were the subject of the modern drama in its infancy, perhaps borrowed by the Cornish from their continental neighbors. It was not their original invention, as the silence of those who have written on the subject would lead us to infer. The second of these manuscripts is of the beginning of the seventeenth century, and is said to have been expressly composed for the purpose of being represented in an ancient British amphitheatre at St. Just, near Penzance. The language was then declining, and the poet must have written rather as it formerly was, than as it was then actually spoken. I cannot do better than give you Dr. Borlase's account of those compositions in his own words.

"Another general custom was the play or interlude in the Cornish tongue. Of these plays the subjects were taken from Scripture, and the design suitably good, even that of instructing the common people in the meaning and excellence of the Holy Scriptures; although the design, it must be owned, is executed in a coarse and rude manner.

"There are two manuscripts in the Bodleian library, which contain some interludes, or, as the author calls them, *Ordinalia*: the first, in parchment, written in the fifteenth century, exhibits three *Ordinalia*; the first treats of the creation of the world, the second of the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, the third of the resurrection. The other manuscript is on paper, written by William Jordan, An. 1611. This has only one *Ordinale*, of

¹ Bib. Bodl. b. xl. Art. given by James Button, Esq., of Worcester-shire, An. 1615.

the creation of the world and the deluge. There is a third book written in Cornish on vellum, which Mr. Ed. Lhuyd, late keeper of the *Musæum* at Oxford, received from John Anstis, Esq., Garter King at Arms. It treats of the passion in metre, but not in dramatic dialogue, intitled Mount Calvary.

“The first *Ordinale* of the creation begins thus (God the Father speaking):

Cornish.

“Eu Tas a Nef yur Gylmyr,
Formyer pub tra a vydh gwrys,
O nan, ha tryon, yn gwyr,
Eu Tas, han Mab, han Spyrys;
Ha hethyn me a thesyr,
Dre ou grath dalleth au Bys.
Y lovaraf, Nef, ha Tyr
Formyys ortho ou brys.”

Englished.

“The Father of Heaven I the maker,
Former of every thing that shall be made,
One, and Three, truly,
The Father, the Son, and the Spirit;
Yes—this day it is my will
Of my especial favor to begin the world.
I have said it—Heaven and Earth,
Be ye formed by my counsel.

“This metre is not ill chosen or unmusical.

“The scanning to be performed in the following manner:

“Eū Tāsā Nēf-yūr Gyl-wŷr,
Fōrmŷ-ēr pūb-trā vŷth-gwŷrys, &c.

“It is the Trochaic Heptasyllable, otherwise called the Trochaic Dimeter Catalectic. It consists of three trochees and a semiped. Aristophanes was very fond of it at times.

“In Latin, Horace adopts it.

“Nōn ēbūr nēque aūrēūm.

“In English, Shakspeare frequently uses it; and Dryden for his tenderest numbers:

“Softly sweet in Lydian measure,
Soon he sooth'd his soul to pleasure.

“The language suits the metre; as the subject is sublime, the composition is not unsuitable, as may be seen by the above and following stanza:

“Yn peswere gwreys perfyth
Then bys ol golowys glan,
Hoga hynwyn y a vyth
An Houll, an Lor, h' an Steryan.

Me a set a Nugh an gueyth
Yn creys an Ebron avan,
An Lor yn nos, Houl yn geyth
May rollons y golow Splan.

“ In the fourth (day) I shall make perfect
For the world all the resplendent lights,
And I will that they be called
The Sun, the Moon, and the Stars.
Then will I place them on high
In the midst of the firmament above,
That the Moon by night, the Sun by day,
May yield their glowing splendor.

“ The stanza consists of eight verses with alternate rhymes ; sometimes this is changed for a stanza of six, of which the first and second are of one rhyme, the fourth and fifth of another, and the third and sixth line of a third rhyme ; but the heptasyllable metre continues throughout, with few deviations, in this piece and all the others.

“ The poetry is the least exceptionable part of these interludes : a person called the Ordinary was the chief manager ; every thing was done as he prescribed, and spoken as he prompted. The persons in the drama are numerous : in this no less than fifty-six in number ; in the second, sixty-two ; in the third, sixty ; princes, patriarchs, saints, angels (good and bad), and even the persons of the ever-blessed Trinity are introduced. Unity of time, action, and place, is not at all attended to ; this first-mentioned play runs through a space of time from the creation to king Solomon’s building the temple, and incongruously ordaining a bishop to keep it. It takes in also the fabulous legend of the martyrdom of Maximilla ; in which part the actors are a bishop, a crosier-bearer, a messenger, four tormentors, the martyr, Gebal and Amalek. The bishop gives to the tormentors, for putting the martyr to death, Behethlan, Bosaneth, and all Chenary. King Solomon speaks the epilogue ; the audience, with a strict charge to appear early on the morrow in order to see the Passion acted, is dismissed in these words :

“ Cornish.

Abarth an Tas,
Menstroles a’ ras,
Pebourgh whare,
Hag ens pub dre.

“ Englished.

In the name of the Father,
Ye minstrels holy,
Tune your pipes,
And let every one go to his home.

“ This may serve to give a general notion of these interludes, which were all translated into English by the late Mr. John Keigwyn of Mousehole, at the desire of the late Right Reverend Sir Jonathan Trelawney, baronet, bishop of Winchester, in a

literal manner, for the better understanding the language, though to the disadvantage of the poet, and his language too. The best composition now extant in the Cornish tongue, is that called Mount Calvary, which is not dramatic, but narrative, and more solemn; the incidents (with few exceptions) are all taken from the gospel history of the Passion, and the circumstances of distress and suffering very affecting. It was first turned into metre, as I imagine, by the before-mentioned Mr. Keigwyn, at the instance of Mr. Scawen of Molinelh above-mentioned; but Mr. Scawen, disliking that translation, has placed a literal one in the Lyttelton copy. But to return to the interludes: The places where they were acted were the *Rounds*, a kind of amphitheatre, with benches either of stone or turf." (Natural History of Cornwall. p. 295.)

Thus far concerning the Interludes; but in another place Dr. Borlase also tells us: "There are also several proverbs still remaining in the ancient Cornish, all savoring of truth, some of pointed wit, some of deep wisdom.

" *Neb na gare y gwayn, coll restoua.*

" He that heeds not gain, must expect loss.

" *Neb na gare y gy, an gwra deveder.*

" He that regards not his dog, will make him a choak sheep.

" *Guel yn guetha vel goafen.*

" It is better to keep than to beg.

" *Gura da, rag ta honan te yn gwra.*

" Do good, for thyself thou dost it.

" Many proverbs relate to caution in speaking, as *Tan Tavas*, Be silent, tongue.

" *Cows nebas, cows da, ha da veth cowsas arta.*

" Speak little, speak well, and well will be spokeu again.

" Of talking of state affairs, there are some remarkable cautions.

" *Cows nebas, cows da, nebas an yevern yw an gwella.*

" Speak little, speak well, little of public matters is best.

" The danger of talking against the government is excellently represented in the following proverb.

" *Nyn* ges gún heb lagas, na kai heb scovern.*

" There is no down without eye, nor hedge without ears."

(Nat. Hist. of Cornwall. p. 319.)

* This is another instance of the digamtona *ges* for *ez*, *est*, *z*, *is*, &c. Thus again, *Dro kez*; *po negez uex dro peth ez*. Bring cheese; if there is not cheese, bring what there is. *Negez* for *nebes*, and *uex* for *kez*, occur in the same line.

I add the following rhymes, which are selected from some that Mr. Tonkin, a Cornishman and antiquarian, procured from Mr. Lhuyd.*

* The following extract from the Preface to his Cornish Grammar and Vocabulary, gives an account of the Cotton Manuscript. Mr. Lhuyd's observations are interesting, as they throw much light on the substitution of letters, or, as I have before expressed it by a general though perhaps improper name, *the Digamma*.

"Mr. Anstus found a British Vocabulary, hand-written many ages since, in the Cotton Library in London, and, as he did always, so according to his good-will on the like occasion before and after, he wrote to me about it. When I had looked over the book, I perceived very well that it was not a Welsh Vocabulary, according to the Latin name (written at the latter end) *Vocabularium Wallicum*; but a Cornish vocabulary, as the thing (according to my thought) must appear to every British reader, that shall consider the translations of these Latin words, viz. Angelus, *Ail*; Stella, *Seren*; Membrum, *Ezel*; Supercilium, *Abranz*; Collum, *Conna*; Palatum, *Stefenii*; Mentum, *Elget*; Tibia, *Elesker*; Vitricus, *Altro*; Regina, *Ruisunes*; Vulgus, *Pobel biogo*; Puer, *Floh*; Senex, *Coth*; Mercator, *Guicour*; Prora, *Flurrog*; Umbra, *Scod*; Milvus, *Scoul*; Bufo, *Croinoe*; Rana, *Gulschin*; Passer, *Golvan*; Pullus, *Ydhraunc*; Scomber, *Brethyl*; Lucius, *Denshoe dour*; Vulpes, *Louvern*; Ursus, *Ors*; Scrofa, *Guis*; Echinus, *Sorb*; and many other words; which are not known among us Welshmen. I know full well that I could produce one, and that with more true likeness, than can the small vocabulary of the British Armoric, or British of the country of Lezou in France, although they are not used now in the county of Cornwall. But this wrong thinking is put away, without much trouble, when we discover that the author of this vocabulary, when he was in want of British words, did write down old English words for the same, by giving them sometimes a Cornish termination; and did not bring any of the words from the French, as he would without doubt, if he had been an Armoric Briton. Now these, and the like, are the words thereof, taken out of the old English: Comes, *Yurl*; Lector, *Redior*; Hamus, *Ilye*; Fiald, *Harfel*; Saltator, *Lappier*; Sartor, *Senyod*; Contentious, *Seriuor*; Spunther, *Brooch*; Fibula, *Streing*; Raptor, *Robbior*; Noctua, *Hule*; Haltec, *Herring*; Praehun, *Bidin*; Lagena, *Kanna*; Truta, *Trud*. Now as it could not be any Armoric Briton that wrote this vocabulary, so neither could it be written by any Welshman. For had he been a Welshman, he would without further consideration have written, *Durkennodh*, *Breyr*, *Llor*, *Telyn* (or *Kulk*), *Neidiur*, *Guniadyth*, *Kynhennys*, *Guaeg*, *Arnestr*, *Yspeliur*, *Pythyan*, *Pennog*, *Guerlodh*, *Ysten*, (or *Kynnog* *Piser*, or *Kostrelh*) and *Brethylh*. In like manner, if it had been done by an Armoric Briton, he would never have named the things called in Latin *Querrens*, *Rhamnus*, *Metus*, *Lepus*, *Hædus*; *Glastanen*, *Eithmen*, *Broz*, *Sconarnog*, *Min*; but instead thereof, *Gūazen daro*, *Lau*, *Lus*, *Gat*, and *Gavar bian*. Doctor Davies (according to my thought) has named this Cornish Vocabulary in the Cotton Library, *Liber Landavensis*; for there are many words in this Welsh Vocabulary, marked *Lib. Land.*, which I never saw in any other book. But yet as he had seen the book, which is now in the Cotton Library, I wonder that he would not draw all the words from that to his own book. Nevertheless the

“ Hye oare gwile padn dah gen tye glan ;
Ha et eyc ollaz, hye dalveath gowas tane.

truth is, I know very well, that the words therein marked Lib. Land. are not written in the book called *Liber Landavensis*; for I have looked over that before written book, in the library of that most learned and most knowing gentleman, the Lord of Lanner, in the country of Guenez, i. e. North Wales, and likewise a fair transcript in the library of Jesus College, in Oxford. There is some hope in me, that the reader will forgive me, that I do not always write after the language of our time, nor yet keep to the writing retained in this Cornish Vocabulary. By perusing the aforesaid written books, I have discovered, that there have happened four noted changes or variations, and remember very much, in the Cornish tongue, within this age, or these last hundred years: and the same being before very little printed in the Latin and Celtic Vocabulary, I was very desirous to give them in the Cornish English Vocabulary by hand here to you. The first change is, to put the letter *b* before the letter *m*, and to speak and write *Tybm*, *Tubm*, *Kadm*, *Tybm*, *Krohman*, and *Kylobman*, &c., in the place of *Tym*, *Tum*, *Kam*, *Gymman*, and *Kylomman*. The second is to put the letter *d* before the letter *n*; and to speak thus, in the place of *Pen*, *Pan*, *Pien*, *Guyn*, *Guan*, *Bron*, *Brynan*; *Pedn*, *Padn*, *Predn*, *Guydn*, *Guadn*, *Brodn*; *Bydnan*. Neither did I see fit to give a place to these changes in this vocabulary; for neither will they hereafter retain these changes; and likewise their language is thence more hard and rugged than it was before: and for that many times you must turn the *m* and *n* to *b* and *d*, by saying *tubbi*, *obba*, *hodda*, *hedda*, where you said before, *tubmi*, *obma*, *hodna*, and *hedna*. And this second novelty hath cast off these words so far from the former words, *tunmi*, *onna*, *kenna* and *kanna*, that not any can at all, neither *Armorice Briton*, nor yet *Welshman*, find out their foundation, by seeing from what place they are come. The third change is, to put the letter *d* before *s*, (the which *s* is almost always pronounced as *x*), and to speak the *s* as *sh*, for I have found out in one of the aforesaid written books, which is a book setting forth miracles out of the Holy Scripture, written, more or less, one hundred and fifty years since, where are these words, just as now you speak them, *Kridzhi*, *Pidzhi*, *Bohodzoch*, *Pedzhar*, *Bledzhar*, *Lagadzho*, &c. instead of these, *Crey*, *Pcy*, *Behosoc*, *Peswar*, *Lagaz*. I know very well that you do not write these words as I write them with *dsh*, but only with the single *g*, or with an *i* consonant; but this falls in with the manner of the English writing: and since the speaking is from thence, the writing must be put and likewise changed from *x* (or *s*), as was the *s* before, from *d* to *t*. The fourth change is turned very much like the third: and that is, to put *sh* after *t*, or (according to the *Armorice* writing) of late the letter *t* for *ch*; and so to change the words *Ty* (or *Tey*) to *Tshey*; *Ti* to *Thi* (or *Chee*), *Pygettu* to *Pygetsha*, and more the like. From whence the other speakings, in which you go off very far from us *Welshmen*, viz. in speaking, *a* for *e*; *e* for *o* and *y*; *i* for *e*; *o* for *u*; and *v* consonant for *f*; and likewise *h* for *x*; *th*, *s* or *h* for *t*, is easy enough; and in part for that few of them are so old, (if any of them are very old,) as our language, and the language of the people of *Lezou*. And another is, in naming of late the letter *t* for *s*; which is not so hugely old, yet may be old enough for the good taking, and keeping it hereafter. But now the reader will ask

Na alle deez perna kinnis war an sawe;
 Na moaz moaz mutle an drize dro dan keaw;
 Rag hedda vedn boz cowze dro dan pow;
 Gwell eye veyha perna nebas glow;
 He hedna vedn gus tubra a sheller e a rag.
 Ha why el evah cor gwella, mor seez de brage.
 Na dale dien gwile treven war an treath;
 Buz, mor mennow direvall war bidn an pow yeine,
 Why dal vey gowas an brossa mine,
 Ha ryney vedh dirra bidn mor, ha gwenz.
 Na gez drog vyth grez, lebben, na kenz."

Thus in English.

"She knows to make cloth good with her wool;
 And she must hearth it, she ought to have fire.
 Nor ought men to buy fuel by the seame,
 Nor go to gather brambles about the hedge;
 For that will be spoken about the country;
 Better she had bought some coal;
 And that will warm you behind and before.
 And you may drink best beer, if you have malt.
 Nor ought men to make houses on the sand;
 But, if you will build up against the country cold,
 You must have the biggest stones,

me, without doubt, why I have in this writing preserved the aforesaid alterations myself, since I knew the deficiencies myself: my answer is, that it was my very great desire, that they might be taken aright; and that every one might know to speak Cornish (or understand further) according to this letter. But my hope is, that you will not in such a manner suffer any other defects in your future Cornish printings, as you have hitherto done in the fore-written alterations. Neither can any one make many novelties in any tongue soever at one time. It is an early work, and therefore too short a licence to take any one thing, before that it be born and bred in the country, to offer it. When any one is willing to know the more late Cornish alterations, that he may the better find them out, let him compare the Cornish words with the like Welsh words of the country of *C'unek* (or, which is much nearer,) and the Armorik words; and when you see the agreement and concord about the consonant letters of these two tongues, then you may see whether the Cornish hath kept to these consonants, or not; if not, you may, without any doubt, know that the Cornish words are changed. For example, when you see that we turn the English words, *to laugh, to play, to whistle, bitter, sin, sister*, in the language of *Guenek*, *suertthin, suare, xubany, suern, suer, suar*; and in the *Armorik*, *xoasin, xouri, xubanat, ruero, xoux, xoor*; but in the *Cornish*, *huertthin, guare, huibanat, huero, hui, hor*; we know then very easily that the *Cornish* is changed. For the like passages are never thus turned by the people of the *Welsh Guenez*; and the people of *Lezou* have learned to turn from them."

And they will last against sea, and wind.
There is no hurt at all done, now, nor before."

Quoted by Polwhele, Vol. iii. p. 31.

There is a quaintness in the three following lines :

" An lavar koth yn lavar gwir,
Na boz nevra doz vaz an tavaz se hir;
Bez den heb davaz o gollaz i dir."

The same, p. 32.

In English.

" The old saying is a true saying,
A tongue too long never did good:
But he that had no tongue, lost his land."

I transcribe the two first stanzas of a Cornish Idyll, with a poetical translation by Mr. Polwhele. I dare not quote more on account of its licentiousness; if there should be any one whose curiosity would lead him to read the whole, he may find it at full length in his *History of Cornwall*, Vol. iii. p. 32.

" Pelca era why moaz moz, fettow, teag,
Gen agaz bedgeth gwin, ha agaz blew mellyn?
Mi a moaz tha 'n venton, sarra wheag,
Rag delkiow sevi gwra muzi teag.

" Pea ve moaz gen a why, moz, fettow, teag,
Gen agaz bedgeth gwin, ha agaz blew mellyn?
Greuh mena why, sarra wheag,
Rag delkiow sevi gwra muzi teag."

In English.

" Pray whither so trippingly, pretty fair maid,
With your face rosy white, and your soft yellow hair?
Sweet Sir, to the well in the summer-wood shade,
For strawberry-leaves make the young maiden fair.

" Shall I go with you, pretty fair maid, to the wood,
With your face rosy white, and your soft yellow hair?
Sweet Sir, if you please;—it will do my heart good;—
For strawberry-leaves make the young maiden fair."

Sermons were preached in Cornish till 1678 by a Mr. Robinson at Landewidnek, near the Lizard; and it is therefore surprising that we have not in it any compositions in prose. This is to be lamented; for though the writings of such men as Robinson and Jackman, who was Cromwell's chaplain at Pendennis, might have little intrinsic merit, yet they would now throw much light on the nature of this departed language. None of these have been printed, because they had nothing in the matter to recommend them, and because they were in a despised and unintelligible dialect. But it is not impossible that some of these might be still

extant in manuscript; and if hereafter, on further research, only a few could be recovered, it would be a material acquisition in a philological point of view.

If the Cornish ever had its bards, like the other British tongues, then lays have been lost, and their names are unknown. I do not however suppose that there were ever many bards in Cornwall; because from its situation and its mines, it acquired so much of the Roman customs, and was so much earlier subjected by the other invaders of Britain. As the language was itself looked upon as rude and barbarous, not only bards, but scarcely any writers, would choose to make it the vehicle of their compositions.

The Lords prayer in Welsh, Cornish, and Armoric, is as follows:

Welsh. -Ein Tad yr hwn wyt yn y nefoedd; Sancteiddier dy enw, Deved dy deyrmas; Byd dy ewyllys ar yddaiar megis y mae yn y nefoedd: Dyn i ni heddyw ein bara bennyddiol; A madden i ni ein dyledion; fel y maddewn ja i' n dyledwyr; Ac nar arwain my brose digaeth; eithr gwared in rhag drwg. Amen.

Cornish.—An Taz ny es yn nef; Bethens thy bannow ughelles; Gwienz doz thy gulasher; Bethens thy voth gwreiz in oar, kepare hag yn nef; Ro thyn ny lithow agan peb dyth bara; Gava thyn ny agan cam, kepare ha gava ny neb es cam ma erbyn ny; Nyn kombreh ny en antel, mez gw gwryth ny the worth drok. Amen.

Armoric.—Hon Tat, petung so en eoun; Or'h hano sanctifiet; De vet de omp Roantelez; Ha volonte bezet gret voar an douar euel en eoun; Roil dezomp hinow hor bara bemdezier; Ha pardonit dezomp hon offancon evelma pardon nomp d' ae re odens hon ofsancl; Ha n' hon digacit quel e' tentation, hoguen hon delivrit a drone. Amen.

Camden very gravely tells us in his Remains, (p. 30.) "That the Armorican Britons, marrying strange women in Armorica, did cut out their tongues, lest their children should corrupt the language with their mothers' tongues." This is at once improbable and ludicrous; but here the Gallic corruptions in the Armorican Lords Prayer at once disprove such a monstrous story. This is another of those instances, where philology comes in to the assistance of history. The fact seems to be, that the Britons married Armorican women, and that, as might have been expected, their language lost something of its purity by this connexion.

The Scriptures are not extant in Cornish; if they had, there can be no doubt that the language would have been preserved. But such was their dislike or their indifference, that the better sort of the Cornish petitioned at the Reformation, that the Scriptures might not be enforced upon them in their mother tongue. A request, which so

well agreed with the political views of government for the union and consolidation of empire, was readily granted.

Mr. Scawen, Mr. Keigwyn, and Mr. Tonkin, were Cornish gentlemen, and friends of Mr. Lhuyd, the celebrated archæologist, and who either had Cornish manuscripts, or wrote in illustration of it. Dr. Pryce, of Redruth, published in 1790 his *Cornish-British Antiquities*, or an *Essay to preserve the Cornish language*. These are the Cornish authorities to which I have had occasion to refer; but some of them have brought so little general literature into the discussion, that where I have not had to notice their inaccuracies, I have yet received little assistance from their labors. Mr. Whitaker, the historian of Manchester, and rector of Ruan Lanyhorne, in Cornwall, is well known.


From the above summary view, you may judge of the poverty of Cornish compositions; but you may perceive also, that what has been advanced by most writers on it, that it is a pleasant and harmonious language, is not destitute of foundation; and that it was circumstances, which doomed it to decline, and be extinguished; and not because it was unworthy or unsusceptible of cultivation. D.

TRANSLATION AND OBSERVATIONS ON AN ODE OF HORACE.

HORAT. CARM. Lib. iii. Ode xxviii.

FESTO quid potius die
Neptuni faciam? Prome reconditum,
Lyde strenua, Cæcubum,
Munitæque adhibe vim sapientiæ.

Inclinare meridiem
Sentis; ac, veluti stet volucris dies,
Parcis deripere horreo
Cessantem Bibuli Consulis amphoram?
Nos cantabimus invicem
Neptunum, et virides Nereïdum comas.
Tu curvâ recines lyrâ

 Latonæ, et celeris spicula Cynthiæ.

Summo carmine, quæ Chidon,
Fulgentesque tenet Cycladas, et Paphon,
Junctis visit oloribus,
Dicetur: meritâ Nox quoque nœniâ.

A TRANSLATION.

What better tribute can I pay
To Neptune's consecrated day?
Alert, my Lyde, draw the wine,
With old Cæcubian deck his shrine.
That prudish coyness now dispel,
So long affected, and so well.
See from its noon declines the day,
And, fleeting, mocks our slow delay.
Still does the dormant jar conceal
The vintage mark'd with Bib'lus' seal?
Mine be the task, with changeeful lays,
To strike the shell in Neptune's praise:
And chant, in lighter strain, the fair
Nereïd Nymphs with sea-green hair.
Be thine Latona's cares to sing,
And tune to Cynthia's darts the string.
At last be sung, who Cean isles,
And Cnidos brightens with her smiles;
Wafted by pinions of the dove,
Who visits Paphos, seat of love.
Night too shall be remember'd, Night—
With festal, or with mystic rite.

Notes critical and explanatory.

Festo. The poet proposes to make an offering to Neptune on his festal day, which is to consist in spending it with the utmost hilarity, free from all business and care, in the company of his mistress.

Luciam. When the verb *facere* occurs in an unconnected way, it generally means *facere* (sacrum). None of the commentators or former translators have adverted to this discrimination, on which the beauty and propriety of the ode in a great measure depends. Thus Virgil, *Ecl.* iii. vs. 77.

Cum "faciam" vitulâ pro frugibus, ipse venito.

And G. i. vs. 339. *Operari* (sacrum), after the same manner;

Sacra refer Cereri, latis "operatus" in herbis.

In both places "*sacrum*," must be understood.

A friend has suggested that *Πῆξιν* is used by the Greeks in the same way with *ἑσπέρῳ*, either expressed or understood. Thus Homer, *Il.* i. vs. 443.

Φοίβω θ' ἱερὴν ἐκατόμβην
 'Ρέξαι ὑπὲρ Δαναῶν ὄφρ' ἱλασσάμεθ' ἄνακτα.

"Phœboque sacra hæcatomben

'Sacrificarem' pro Danaïs, ut placemus Deum." Clarke.¹

The poet makes the offering, and assigns to his mistress the province of pouring out the libation, since the festal rites were to be celebrated in her apartments. After these were duly performed, the parties themselves proceeded to apply to their own use the remaining portion of the sacrifice. The passage having been consulted to establish by the authority of Horace this signification for another purpose; and a disappointment having taken place from its not being thus noticed by the commentators, has led to the present translation.

Cacubum. The Cæcubian wine was particularly reserved for libations and festal entertainments. Thus Caïn. lib. v. ode ix. *Quando repōstum—Cacubum ad festos dies—latus—bibam*.

Adhibe vim sapientiæ. 'This is usually understood to signify, "to give new force to guarded wisdom." But the scope of the reasoning requires, that by the instrumentality of old mellow wine, some degree of "violence" should be given to accustomed prudence. And the poet, as a casuist, would scarcely remind his mistress to fortify what, as a lover, he was endeavouring to undermine. Nearly the same phrase is used by Cicero: *Vim vitæ afferre*, to offer violence to life; and variously in his works.

Horace himself has the same sentiment in his Ode *Ad Amphorum*, in which there are many similar places to this under consideration, and they mutually serve to illustrate each other. He says of his jar of wine, and the similarity is noticed by Cruquius, *Tu lene tormentum* (a gentle assault) *ingenio admo-ves—plerumque duro*: and in another part, *Narratur et prisci Catonis—Sæpe mero caluisse virtus*. The *virtus Catonis*, and *sapientia Lydæ*, were both expected to relax from their usual severity by the influence, and moderate indulgence of wine. Many other parallel places are traced, and pointed out in these notes.

¹ *Ποίω* is used in the same sense by Xenophon; and in Virgil, *Æn. viii. 188*. we find—*sævis, hospes Trojane, periclis*

Servati facimus;

spoken by Evander, when he relates the cause of the annual sacrifice celebrated in the city of Pallanteum. Ed.

Parcis deripere. In most editions the poet puts this in form of a question, showing some impatience to prepare the libation, and proceed to the festivities of the day, since all the wine of the Romans, destined for store, was formed into a decoction, called *defrutum*, being boiled down with spices to the consistence of honey or jelly: this inspissated juice to be made potable was liquified by water; and the old wine thus managed became what Horace terms *languidiora vinum*. We may suppose the form of the libation to be somewhat after this manner, like those recorded by Cato: “Te, Neptune, hoc libamine vini Cæcubi precor, uti sis volens propitius mihi, familiaque meæ, et omnibus sub domicilio nostro commorantibus.”

Deripere horreo cessantem amphoram. The words here used are analogous, yet varied in the expression, to those at the beginning of the Ode; *deripere* corresponding with *promere*; and *cessantem amphoram* with *Cæcubum reconditum*. When the *amphora* cessans had remained long enough in a state of rest (*in horreo*), it became the *pia testa moveri digna bono die* of the former Ode (*ex horreo*). These expressions therefore of rest and removal are assignable to the stored mellow wine, which from age had become of an excellent quality.

Bibuli Consulis. Horace was born in the Consulate of Manlius, A. U. C. 688. Bibulus was Consul 694; consequently the wine had been hoarded from the time that Horace was six years old.

Neptunum. After all due preparations the poet proposes to consummate their joint offerings by song and festivity. On his part to sing alternately of Neptune, to whom the day was dedicated, and his attendant Nereids; who were accounted Nymphs beautiful in their persons, and accomplished in their manners, yet at the same time gay and easy in their conduct of life; *Panopeia* (as observed by Servius) being the only one of the thousand designated by the appellation of *Virgo*.

Latonam et spicula Cynthia. The office of singing alternately (*invicem* being understood) of *Latona* and *Cynthia* is assigned to Lyde: of *Latona*, because she presided over the cares of parturition; of *Cynthia*, because, to make his conquest appear more difficult, she would probably celebrate the chastity of that goddess, who was more attached to the pursuits of the chase than of those of love. *Cynthia* was also invoked three times by women in child-birth, as *Diva triformis*, once under each name of *Luna*, *Diana*, and *Hecate*.

Summo carmine. Last of all, he says, shall be celebrated a

Deity who shall be nameless, but one who presides over *Cnidos*, the *Cyclades* and *Paphos*: and who, if she is in good humor (*si lata aderit*), makes these places bright by her presence; (*fulgentes* having this signification.)

Nenia. The *nenia* were properly memorials of conquerors generally recorded at their funerals, and hence they were accounted dirges; but here they are taken to signify memorials of such actions of lovers, as were celebrated under the auspices of the Goddess of Darkness.

The last stanza of this quoted ode may be thus translated: "But, my prattling Muse, do not, relinquishing your talent for pleasantry, draw back from handling again, (*retractare* having the same force as *revellere*, "to retract," "to re-vel," or in a stronger sense "to pluck up by the roots") your wonted office of recording the Cean memorials (of love): but seek with me to modulate your song to lighter notes, within some retired grove, consecrate to the Daughter of *Dione*."

Euripides calls Venus—*θεὰ σκοτειὰ καὶ νύκτι θαυμαστή*,

"*Dea tenebris et noctu admiranda*."

The subject of the ode, according to modern notions of propriety, should have ended at *dicitur*: but the poet, who was an Epicurean, both in principle and practice, extends his festivities into the night also.

ROBERT HOBLIN.

SOME EMENDATIONS ON ARISTOTLE.

[*Duval's Edition.*]

By the Rev. J. SEAGER, Rector of Welch Bicknor,
Monmouthshire.

De *historiâ Animal.* VII. c. 11. Καὶ ὅσαις δ' ἂν μὴ γινομένων
τῶν καθαρῶν αἷμα συμπέσῃ ἐμέσαι, οὐθὲν βλάπτονται.
Before it was ἀμα.

Porphyrus. cap. ix. 3. Κοινὸν δὲ καὶ τὸ συνωνύμως...

x. 4. Τὰ δὲ γένη ΚΑΤΑ τὰ εἶδη φύσει...

Aristotle. Vol. I.

p. 17. l. 4 ἐ γινον.—p. 34. l. 9. Τῷ γὰρ τὸν χρόνον πλείω, &c. p. 35. c. xiv. l. 3. οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ γέεισις, φθορα, οὐδέ γε αὔξεισις, οὐδέ μειωσις, οὐδέ κατα τοκοι μ.—p. 38. l. 6. αὐτὰ μὲν οὖν καθ' αὐτά Aristotle must mean verbs in the infinitive mood, which express neither time nor affirmation.—p. 39. last line but one. ΤΟ καθολον κατηγορεῖται.

Metecorolog. I. p. 544. l. 30 αἰουμένου τοῦ ἀγγείου.—p. 547. last line but one, ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἀργη.—p. 583. l. 1. Ἀπὸ ΤΟΥ ἡλίου. — 583. l. 8 οὐκ ἔπ' τὴν γῆν φέρεται, Along the earth.—609. last line but three, δεχομένη. So Budæus seems to have read.—610. l. 8 read ΧΑΙταιουσαι.

I. 610. D. l. 11. κατὰ το ἐγγίον Δὲ καὶ Παρρώτερον Θεοῦ εἶναι μᾶλλον Τε καὶ ἥττον... Same page, last line, αὐτοῦργεῖ τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς. II. 795. l. 7. οὔτε τὸν πυροβολον, ἀλλὰ τὴν, &c. omitting εὐμὸν. 797. l. 4. εἰς τα σκελη, ἐκατέρὰ ΤΟ παρ' ἐαυτῇ.—800. D. l. 1. πρὸς τε τὴν ΡΑΙΝ μᾶλλον... 866. D. l. 9. περὶ ἑπείρεται, p. 903. B. 2. διὰ τῶν φΥομένων?—904. D. 10. προσήΠουσα.—and so Gaza seems to have read.—908. B. 2. υπερβολή means excess, i. e. of heat or cold.—910. E. 3. φαίνεται ἀΔΡανῆς? 915. C. 11. περὶ ἑπείρεται, drawing the stones close round.—929. E. 1. ΜΙ τα δὲ ταυτα.—930. B. 10. ὅπως μὴ ἄλλος.—943. C. 1. perhaps πΟτιθεται. So Gaza seems to have read.—955. C. 6. Omit ισχει, which seems to have been wrongly taken in from line 10,— then we must stop thus, ξινθός· καὶ τὴν φωνήν, (understand μετα-, βαλλεῖ ἐν μὲν γὰρ, &c. Vol. III. p. 198. D. 10. ἄλλον τιὰ τ.— 199. D. 9. ἐμπείρως. Men of practice are imposed on by the specious discourse of men of theory, who are quite incapable of practical knowledge. Vol. IV. 686. D. 9. Παχύνει.—Ibid. E. 2. πυρικανστα. ἡ ΟΥ δια τὸ αὐτό; ποιεῖ μὲν γὰρ σ.... 691. A. 6. διὰ τὸ μᾶλλον. i. e. δια τὸ μᾶλλον θερμαίνεσθαι. Vol. III. 293. D. 4. καὶ (even) τὴν δικαίαν ἩδΟΝΗν καὶ τὸ τετάχθαι, . . . Vol. IV. 694. c. 2. perhaps ἀπορήπτειν ΤΑ ΠΕΡΙΒΟΛΑΙΑ. Vol. IV. 727. D. 5. ὁ Ἰπερ " because." 728. A. 9. Τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις ΟΥ νόσημα. " In other animals it is no disease, but natural, to be spotted with white." 729. B. 8. . . τῆς ἐν ΣΤῆθει διατριβῆς? " On the breast," i. e. In arms. Begin quest. μγ.—734. D. 7. οὐδένα. διὰ ΔΗ τὸ τὴν διαλεκτον εὐφθαρτον εἶναι, τὴν αὐτὴν δὲ ἀρχὴν ἀμφοτέρων εἶναι, καὶ τῆς διαλέκτου, (φωνή) γάρ τις καὶ τῆς ἀκοῆς, ὥσπερ ἘΚ συμβεβηκότος ῥῆστα, &c.—735. B. φθέγονται. καὶ ὁμιον τοῖς ἀπεχουσι καὶ τῆς ἡχοῦς. And the sound of an echo is sharper, like those who are at a distance.

Vol. IV. 688. c. 6. Διὰ τι . . , πρόσωπα; ἡ ὅσα ἀραιὰ καὶ ὑγρά μάλιστα, διὰ τούτων . . . &c.—689. D. 10. παύσονται.—690. A. 2. ἡ ὁτΕ μᾶλλον . . . 690. B. 14. . . ποιούσι (scil. ἰδρῶτα. " they are making, or preparing it.") πεπονηότες δὲ πεπολήκασι.—691. E.

6. ἰδρῶσι ταῦτα οἷς πονοῦσι.—694. B. 9. μᾶλλον, ὅσοι ἂν... 694. c. 11. οἰκεία, θερμότητι. ἈΛΛΟΓΡΙΐ μεγνύμενος, ... 694. E. 8. ὅ, τι γὰρ αἱ ... 695. c. 12. τρογὴ, Γοῦν πεπεμμένη ... 696. D. 3. ἐπιπολῆ must mean, On the surface of the contents of the stomach. 698. B. 7. ... διαφέρει, ἐὰν μὲν ΜΗ ὑποθῇ ... 698. c. 3. καταρτῶμενα means, I suppose, heavy bodies tied to a string; the end of the string being held in the hand, the bodies move in a circle.—699. A. 8. ἂν δὲ ἥ ἐν ἡ ὑγρότης.—699. B. 4. μᾶλλον ὅσοι ἂν ... 707. B. 1. τοῦ δὲ θίρου ταῖς μὲν ... 709. B. 8. ὁ θέλῃ running.—712. D. 3. πληγέντος, when a person has struck his foot—for this occasions sometimes a swelling in the groin) 5. τῆς ἀρχῆς the origin of the malady, (which origin is in the foot.)—713. c. 2. ὑπερβολήν.—716. B. 3. ὥστε πρὸς τὸ ἐναντίον, TO 'ENANTION σχῆμα πρὸ ἔργου.—719. E. 10. ἡ ὕπερ. πλείων.—720. D. 12. τῷ TO ὑγρὸν πεπηγέναι, on account of the consolidation of the moisture. 721. E. 8. ... ἡ οὐλὴ ἈνΕΥ τοῦτΟΥ (i. e. without any disorder of the spleen) γίνεσθαι ... 722. D. 1. τοῦ χαλκοῦ ΟΥ πηγνύται, ἀλλὰ ... 722. E. 6. φαίνεται. Ἔτι μὰ μεγάλη ἔλκη καὶ πολυχρόνια μελαίνας τὰς οὐλὰς ἴσχει τὸ δὲ πολλὰ κίς: . 723. c. 1. ὑπερ σάρκα.—723. c. 6. προσεστώς.—736. D. 10. κινῶσιν ἔτι δὲ ἐπιπολῆς.—737. c. 2. ἐν, ἥ ΔΕ ΠΑΧΕΙΑ πλείω.—4. αὐτὸ. (i. e. πρὸς) in the nominative.—738. A. 11. τῶν ἄλλων ὈΜΟΙΩΣ (or ὡσαύτως) ἐπαρχόντων αὐταῖς; that is “ceteris paribus,” for the materials, &c. of the chords might make a difference.—739. B. 7. κατὰ φύσιν, (διὸ ολίγοις τοῦτο συμβαίνει) καὶ φύσει &c.—740. E. 8. ἐκρίνῃς, scilicet ἡ διάνοια. Capable of judging or distinguishing.—Next line, αὐτῇ.—741. B. 8. οὐκ ἈΠ' ἴσης, “with.”—741. D. 3. Ἀκούεται for κρούεται.—8. βραδύτερα.—743. A. 6. πόρρω Ἴον ... 10. ψοφούντων.—749. B. 3. ἄλλοτε in one word, “num.” 6. ΤΟΥτῳ δὲ ... i. e. σκαρόδφ.—749. c. 6. κενουμένης.—749. D. 10. κυφωτέρων.—750. c. 6. πυρετὸς ἔΝΩ, τῶν ἑξω. —

CAMBRIDGE PRIZE ESSAY FOR 1802.

QUENAM SINT CAUSÆ, CUR PRÆSTANTISSIMA IN OMNI
OPERE ET SCIENTIA INGENIA, IISDEM FERRE TEMPORUM
ET REGIONUM FINIBUS CONTINERI SOLEANT?

DEO, Optimo, Maximo, visum est inter alia summæ erga suos
benefolentie indicia, id scilicet curavisse, ut certis aliquando
annorum intervallis enascerentur aliqui, tum capaciōri intellectu,
tum elatioribus affectibus cœlestem, ultra quam mortalitati fere

obtrigit, originem referentes. Illi sunt, quorum vitam respicere possint alii, velut astra nocturni viatores; quorum oratione, exemplo, scriptis, ad sapientiam atque virtutem informari debeant et impelli; Illi sunt, de quibus, Academici, hodie mihi demandatum est qualiacunque disputare, quæsituto, "QUÆNAM SINT CAUSSÆ, CUR PRÆSENTISSIMA IN OMNI OPERE AC SCIENTIA INGENIA, IISDEM FERE TEMPORUM REGIONUMQUE FINIBUS CONTINERI SOLEANT." Si quis igitur annulum notis diligentius paullo institerit, is quatuor tantum mundo illuxisse sæcula reperiet, in quibus absolutæ sunt admodum et perfectæ artes: ea vocare liceat Socraticum, Ciceronianum, Medicæum, Newtonianum; quot vero in iis floruerint et qui viri, si equidem percensussem, id esset hominis jejune mathematicæque dimeticientis quam spissus in lacteo orbe coeat colluceatque stellarum chorus.——

Jam nostra de questione, cum multiplex sit et subobscura, copiosius inter philosophos quam accurate est disceptatum. Alii certam quandam præ se ferunt "cœli terræque proprietatem;" quasi quibus sphaera circulis lineisque, iisdem circumscribi posset et concludi humana mens. Sunt qui mirandam nescio cujus Fatu potentiam occultasque siderum rationes sibi finxere; quorum inehereule ubi peculiaris indulgentia regionem aliquam exceperit, continuo emicet ibi necesse est Cadmeum quoddam agmen, fortibus fulgentibusque armis doctrinæ et literarum instructissimum. Aliis demum persuasum fuit, ætatis quippe suæ sterilitatem expertis, Naturam,³ sicut agrum, ubertate prioris ævi defatigatam atque effetam, nequire pristina benignitate præbere mortalibus ingenii alimenta; sed⁴ non mutatur Natura, quia non mutatur auctor moderatorque Naturæ. — Restat itaque, non tam ceterorum refellere sententias, quam proferre meam: si mea quidem vocanda est, quam, cum erudito olim viro⁵, in inuentem venerit, ipse amplificandam suscepi et illustrandam. Age vero experiamur, si qua sub Ajacis⁶ clypeo Teucer scopum attingam. Artes igitur crediderim, quo a principio habuere ortum, ab eo certis præcipue temporibus vignisse: e legitima scilicet ingenii et morum progressionem, eque fortuito simul externarum causarum felicique concursu. Enimvero respicite Solem atque intuemini, quam exsiliens e crepusculorum quasi cunæulo ad decurrenda cœli spatia aggrediatur; quam

¹ Livius. Du Bos—Fontenelle, &c.

³ Columella.

⁵ Blackwall's Life of Homer. p. 75.

² Juvenalis—Bossu, &c.

⁴ Averrannus. p. 332.

⁶ Hom. Il. 9. 266.

inter eundem magis effulgeat magisque, sudam nactus et serenam tempestatem; quam ei obvemat, ipsum aliquando nebulis obscurari, misceri turbinibus, defectus pati; quam porro, simul ac meridianum culmen attingat, cœperit se inclinare; donec amplissima sed languidiore luce paullatim totus occidat, non, nisi per noctem et tenebras, rursum oriturus. Eodem videbitis, Academici, ac parili modo, affici humanum animum: cujus varia in progressu incrementa, altitudinem, atque occasum; quibus insuper rebus floreat interea aut afficiatur, paucis exponam. In primis dissipatorum hominum congregationibus, inque rudi qualibet vitæ societate, ad necessarias artes effluendas rependiendamque corporeæ salutis rationem omnino incumbit animus: qui cum interea rebus imposuit nomina, et pæne infinitos vocis sonos una atque altera literarum nota terminavit, inde sensa sua numeris¹ cœpit includere, postmodo prosa oratione. Quid deinde leges dicam latas, aut in numinum honore composita carmina? quid oppidorum munitiones, aut agriculturæ opera, alias denique utilitates, quæ omnes ab imitatione solent profluere? Protenus in hac ætate, quæ necessitatis vocetur, cunctarum fere inventionum jacta sunt fundamenta: harum enim ea est natura, ut nullo politæ mentis studio, nulla eruditæ cogitationis vi certo possint extendi; sponte vero sua videtur quæque e nebula quadam erumpere, et interesse turbæ indagantium, ut Æneas ille Virgilianus, (Æn. 1.)

Cunctisque repente

Improvisa loqui, "coram, quem quæritis, adsum."

Itaque dum omnes plurima ignota tentarent, multis aliqui novis oportet occurrerint. Ad finem demum hujusce spatii, asperos sane ac religiosos, sed integros hominum et fortes mores credideris: linguam, si non limatam, gravem tamen et cum simplicitate magnificam: Et jam suus atque unicus epico carmini honor, ipsam inter militiam et heroas florentissimus; sola etenim Musarum Calliope clypeo induitur.

Porro, ut a necessariis artibus ad utiles defluximus, ita ab utilibus ad elegantes sumus delapsi: quare hæc ætas, elegantia nuncupatur. Hic autem prosa oratio, quæ poësin, veluti puella matrem, haud æquis passibus sequebatur, incedere cœpit altiusque ingredi: cumque hujus, die scilicet mitigatus, deferbuit vehementior spiritus, illam plenissima maturitate contigit expleri. Parem quinimo ac similem vicem expertæ sunt mentes hominum: post enim istam priscorum barbariem delevere usus et

¹ Ὁ πρῶτος λόγος μίμημα τοῦ ποιητικοῦ λόγου. Strabo, 1.—et Longini Fragg.

necessitudo, jam in alterius rationes magis quisque et magis congruere, jam tenuia vitæ officia lenioresque amicitiarum excolere virtutes; unde communis quædam facilitas morum et dulcedo oriunda est, eaque polita inter populos et concivis benevolentia, quæ pulcherrimum nomen obtinet humanitatis.

Continuo in scenam prodit Poesis, ad depingendos sæculi mores exhibendasque mentis affectiones aptissima: quos aut graviore exaggeret sermone, aut condit lulari, aut acri destringat; hoc præcipue spectans, ut diversissima virtutum vitiorumque lineamenta fideliter possit ostendere. Hujus in amplissimam quasi clientelam conferunt se Artes, quotquot officio est, varias rerum formas atque imagines per imitationem exprimere, coloribus, saxo, quavis denique materie: Hæ omnes umbratili otio, et placida quiete sunt contentæ. Contra autem Eloquentia, rebus nata agendis, in frequentissima luce atque in oculis hominum versatur: ea est, quæ pulcherrimo Professionum cincta comitatu, habenas moderatur imperii, bellorum et pacis claves tenet, ipsi etiam Justitiæ assidet, domina magis quam comes. Similis est Homereo Achilli, famæ semper suæ instanti, prima semper sibi vindicanti: idem, cum ad pugnam ventum sit, suos in confertissimam hostium aciem impellit, voce, vultu, dextera; idem, in castrorum solitudinem detrusus, tabescit inertia et defatigatur. At Poesis Helenam illam refert, quæ domo interiore cum ancillis desidet, et varia florum artificia intertextit vestimentis; negotiorum, ut impar, ita secura.

Succrevit jam interea et adoluit Philosophia, quæ foemineum hujusce cultum, sine deliciis; virilem illius vim, sine impetu, conjunctos sibi una conciliat. Ejus est, morum indagare principia, et rationis limites præfinire: unde doceat, quid est virtus, quæ honesti exemplaria; doceat, qualis sit veritas, quibusque indicis agnoscenda. Ejus etiam est, Naturam introspicere, suo cælum ipsum ingenio supponere, omnes denique omnium rerum usus et proprietates, experiendo; causas atque elementa persequi, componendo ac dissociando. Qui igitur potest animus, quin propiore quasi oculo purissimæ in luce Deum coram intueatur; interque opera ejus perscrutanda, ipsum opificem humillime deveneretur, sanctissime colat, amet pietissime?

Hactenus Philosophia, centum Scientias complexa, consensere demum cœpit et languere, usque dum tertia atque ultima superveniat ætas, dicta Luxuriæ. Enimvero quod Capua erat Annibali, id luxuria est menti humanæ: prohibet quippe, ne Romam perveniamus. Desidiosa scilicet voluptate deliquescit omne illud pectoris generosissimum robur: omnis illa ardens

liberalisque affectuum dilabitur vis, per quam aut ad nova tentanda, aut ad vetera ulterius propaganda incitari solemus et impelli. Pœnus itaque miles, antea in eundo strenuus, in pugna alacer, evasit ab hybernorum mollitie incers, liebes, laboris impatiens; et qui omnia sua secum modo portabat, nunc spoliolum et meretricularum et coquorum impediementis oneratus, exercitui interfuit ad speciem magis quam ad rem composito. Sic et animi, ut ita loquar, copiae, luxu corrumpuntur: neque jam in acie quidquam videas, præter inanes Metaphysicorum velitationes; aut levia Criticorum tela incursusque; aut artificiosam Logices et inefficacem disciplinam: ne quidem bellicum canit Poesis sed "plorabile quiddam eliquat" et subinsulsum. Post igitur aspera Alpium superata, post fertilissimos Italiæ victoria perlustratos campos, tandem demum in otia Campaniæ et exitium videmur declinasse.

Usque adeo, Academici, naturalem mentis humanæ progressionem; quotque ab ea quibusque modis profluunt utilitates, conatus sum adumbrare; neque vos interea ipsos fugiet, plurimas harum, prope dixeram omnes, intra breve mediæ sæculi spatium, tanquam claustra quædam sua cancellosque, coercitas videri et circumseptas. Supervacaneum itaque foret demonstrare, certis itidem regionum finibus solere eas comprehendere; cum, nisi in iis populis, quorum mores induerint elegantiam, florere non posse oporteat.—Illud porro ausim confirmare, causam hancce, quam proposui, semper esse actuosam, usquequaque physica constantique ratione polleentem; neque, externis modo rebus non impediatur, unquam fore hæsuram. Sed ut navis, bona, quod aiunt, alite soluta, quem spectarit portum tuto debet invenire; nunc citius, prout aura faverit, nunc tardius decurrens oceanum: sæpe autem vi procellarum aliorum rapiatur, illidenda scopulis; aut in breviora urgetur ac syrtes; sæpe etiam frangitur omnino et dissipatur; vento quippe enim usa est nimium secundo, vel copia deficitur instrumentorum, vel occulto fortasse vermium morsu peressa demum contabuit. Neque aliter cum instituto humanæ mentis itine se res habet: quæ autem et quam multæ interveniunt tempestates, quamque raro aspiraverit fortuna, horum omnium neque facilis esset neque jucunda commemoratio. ¹ Piget enim verò respicere sex millium annorum seriem, cujus exigua sane pars scintillulis aliquibus coruscavit, exiguis, namque vera plena luce effulsit sapientiæ: reliqua jacuit ignorantiae tenebris obruta penitus atque oppressa:—piget

¹ V. Gibbon. 7. 154. not.

etiam diffusos circumcirca orbis terrarum respicere populos, omnes ad artificis divini effigiem formatos, omnes immortalitati addictos, omnes felicissimæ rationis capaces; quorum tamen infinita pæne multitudo frustra vixisse potest videri, quibus scilicet nullatenus arrisit Cognitio, angulorum quorundam et quasi punctorum incola et civis.—Jam autem inter plurimas quæ a recta via depellere solent et deturbare ingenium, tres præcipue causæ memorantur; quarum in primis bellum incursare contigit; idque jure, si eousque incumbat populo, ita intimis personarum negotiis continus intercedat, ut aut emoveat ipsos e sedibus, aut continuas studii exercitationes distrabat irrumpendo; unde oriatur necesse est¹ maximum illud perfecti operis impedimentum, frequens et mobilis transitus.—Minime tamen is sum, qui militares ab aliis artibus abhorreere censuerim; immo familiarissimæ sunt inter se comites, convivæ, contubernales. Quandoquidem² ut in homine vigor corporis animique simul fere maturescunt, nisi quod ille hunc paullo antevertat; sic in rebuspublicis militaris gloria literataque aut coæva sunt, aut se proxime consequuntur. Nec sane aliter fieri potest: id etenim quod instigat sensus, sine præcipitando; acuit sine divellendo; accendit, nec tamen inflamat; commovet, nec tamen confundit; id omne, cum utile judicari, tum etiam pæne necessarium. Abeat autem decantata ea otii gratia, abeat ille principum favor, quibus ali foverique Scientias³ vetus est perinde atque inanis opinio. Modo non tumultuatum sit, haud pacis eget ingenium: modo non contundatur barbaria, haud aliunde honorem, quam ipsa ex se acquirit doctrina.—Tunc enim ea profecto prope abest ab exulando, cum propriam ipsius et quasi pontificalem exuta majestatem, componitur ad exemplum patroni; circa aulas versabunda, et atriensem agens: tunc demum armis annisque fractus est Carthaginiensis, cum imperatoria veste rejecta fugit ad externa subsidia,

atque ibi magnus,

Mirandusque cliens, sedet ad prætoria regis,

Donec Bithyno libeat vigilare tyranno.⁴

Sequitur alia moræ causa, qua nescio an ullum usquam sit posterius malum: evenit nimirum ex Servitute, ea debilitata animi et humilis et abjecta timiditas, quæ erumpere aliquando inque virtutis campo exspatiari nequit; quæ, suo carens arbitrio, ad

¹ Paternulus. lib. 1. ad fin.

² Bacon de Augm. Scient. p. 31. ed. fol.

³ Juv. 10.

⁴ V. Cicero in Bruto. Cf. Ferguson on Civil Society. 3. 8. 299.

alterius nutum tota fingitur; acerbissimumque dominationis jugum sine jactando perferre potest.—Hæc de corporis servitute—quid ergo erit expectandum, siquando ipsam etiam rationem edomuerit Superstitio? cujus contra horribilem aspectum quotus est quisque mortalium qui oculos audeat attollere? Cum ea itaque arcana semel terrore et sancta occupatam ignorantia obligaverit sibi rudis intellectus imbecillitatem, quis locus est doctrinæ relictus? quis præscriptus barbariæ terminus?—hinc scilicet est, quod jam per plura sæcula Artes et Scientiæ non, nisi in Christianis populis, florere:—Possem hīs alias subnectere et plures causas; quæ licet minutiores, neque certo tenore proveniant, concurrentes tamen inter se et coherescentes, ingenii cursum, uti remoræ quædam, impediunt. Sed hæc olim fortasse erint notandæ, dum in præcipuis quatuor aureorum temporum meritis, et propria cujusque forma, exprimendis, versabitur oratio mea. Jam autem contemplamini Athenas atque admiramini, quam urbem peculiaris Dei providentia nobis, Academici, videtur excitasse, ut unum quoddam debeat virtutibus, perfectum, cum Natura, tum industria, mortalis conditio: ut ex eadem, parente, altrice, patria, “humanitas, doctrina, religio, fruges, jura, leges ortæ forent ac distributæ:” ut inter caliginem annorum, quædam Pharos; inter lucem, esset mundi oculus: sæculo suo succus et sanguis; posteritati sensorium. Hæc inter finitimos undequaque populos, bonorum steriles pæne et seros studiorum, hæc urbs² Græciæ erat Græcia: adeo ut¹ corpora illius gentis separata in alias civitates, ingenia solis Atheniensium muris clausa viderentur. Itaque dum apud Eurotam et Asopum nihil erat nisi armorum strepitus, aut tristior adhuc solitudinis quies; †Ilyssi ripas perambulat Philosophia, interque Cephisi platanos verum quærebat: cuncta vivebant, movebant cuncta: omnesque omnium nervi, sensus, facultates, affectiones, ad summam laudis exercitationem omnino intendebantur. Quid igitur mirum, si pulcherrimo cognationis vinculo ibi conjungerentur universa artium turba: si in picta Polygnoti porticu doceret divina Zenonis vox: si inter tenerrimas Tragici venustates e Socratico ore deflueret Sapientia? Atqui ipsum me contineo, ne rerum historiam unicuique vestrum notissimam

¹ V. Harris' Philolog. Inquiries. 3. 257. Hermes. 5. 417. Shaftesbury. 3. 97. ed. duod.

² Ἐλλάδα; Ἑλλάς, Ἀθῆναι Anthol.

³ Patere.

⁴ Platonis Academia—Aristotelis Lyceum. Cf. Gibbon. 7. p. 143.

pro voluptate longius persequar: idem meminere velim, Atticam, solam esse Hælladis regionem, quæ nascente republica non passa est¹ migrationes: quæ, post depulsam Persarum a cervicibus suis dominationem, liberrimi sibi formam constituit imperii: cujus gubernacula, neque unius voluntas, neque paucorum factio, sed optimum eloquentiæ consilium tractavit; cujus arma, non tam ad sui defensionem, quam ad externos debellandos sunt parata. Earum ideo quas habuere cetera loca, utilitatum, ipsi pariter contigit facultas; quibus aliæ sunt afflictatæ, ea sola caruit molestiis: donc suorum æque licentia ac Macedonum vi fracta, hospitium jam inde præbuerit doctrinis, non originem: educarit ingenia, non genuerit. Talem excepit Italia, per quingentorum annorum lapsum intestinis præliis continuo occupata: cum jam mores ejus per commercia molli; et, jacente hoste, ipsa demum cæpit quiescere: necdum excogitatis, quod sui imitarentur, ex Achaia, e Sicilia, e toto denique orbe collata sibi transtulit illustrissimi cujusque operis exempla; quæ porro felici quadam generosaque cura fecit publicata,² ita ut unaquæque ars, non in exilia villarum et carceres esset detrusa, ut nunc fit, sed urbe excubaret, resque communis esset civium: tum progressio admirabilis, incredibilisque cursus ad universam excellentiam factus est. In hoc autem brevissime processit, quippe quæ totius mundi³ libertatem rescindere aggressa, suam ipsa amiserit: adeo ut iisdem fere terminis, quibus vita M. Tullii, Romæ etiam fama concludatur. Quis enim extra Ciceronis memoriam natus, aut virtute fuit maximus, aut perfectum⁴ proæ eloquentiæ decus attigit? Quis, nisi ab illo visus, vel qui ipsum viderit, aliquod summæ pulchritudinis invenit, fecit, scripsit? Probe nimirum id novit pestilentissimus humani animi iste hostis, a tyrannide virtutem, a servitio abhorre sapientiam: novit suos, potentiæ ipsorum conscios, non ferreis violentiæ, sed aureis desidiæ vinculis esse devinciendos: hoc itaque consuluit Augustus, hoc effecit, ut, dum privata cujusque licentia, publica videretur Libertas, æqualitate omni exuta, jussa tantum principis cuncti obsequiose aspectarent. Inmissis igitur in urbem, tanquam e cavea feris, Voluptate et Inertia, inde creata est Luxuries, Avaritia⁵ exstitit, erupit Audacia; acerrimæ mentis inexorabilesque dominæ. Ex quo tempore nemo⁵ Romanorum

¹ Thucydides. 1.

² "Hoc idem evenisse grammaticis, plasticis, pictoribus, sculptoribus, quisquis temporum institerit notis, reperiet." Paternus. 1.

³ V. Plinium. N. H. 35. 10. Roscoe. 2. 193.

⁴ Shaftes. 1. 148.

⁵ V. Longin. cap. ult.

sursum tueri potuit : tum is superbissimus nequitiae despectus, is honestus recti ardor, ea magnanima difficultatum contemptio, isque excelsus elatusque excellendi spiritus, deferbuere, periere, evanuerunt :—Post autem diuturnam libidinum et crudelitatis tempestatem, respirare paullum visa est Roma ; cum primo beatoris sæculi ortu, res olim dissociabiles miscuit Nerva,¹ principatum ac libertatem. Cujus peculiari indulgentia, flosculos quosdam literarum subito exsurgere, atque ascito horti topote, breviter luxuriare cerneret : sed, ut quercus vigeat, necesse est inter sylvas lente augescat, et radices alte agat, et expectet solem, et turbinibus obluctetur. Quare etiam accidit, id quod² observandum est, omnem terram uno sapientiae proventu effetam, non iterum usquam parere, nisi ita diu intacta jaceat et inculta, ut novo demum ubere quodammodo redintegraretur. Exacta ideo longissima nescio quotorum ævorum sterilitate, pulcherrimam rursus sibi in Italia sobolem produxit Natura. Sed quid equidem in Medicea hacce ætate commemorare pergam fœderatas tum mercatura tum disciplinis civitates : quid felicissimam Florentiæ cum³ Byzantio cognitionem ? quid proposita publice laudis præmia ? quid præclusas ad dignitatem semitas, præter virtutis unicam ? Hæc enim uti in manibus sint omnium inque mentibus hæreant recentia, optime curavit hodiernus inter nostrates vir ; qui elegantissime negotiorum intervalla dispungens otio, documentum edidit, quantum temporis a necessariis multiplicum curarum officiis, quantum ab amicorum colloquio, quantum denique a voluptate excerpti possit, ad delectandum erudiendumque orbem. Caruisset alioquin merita ipsius gloria hæc urbs, quæ exiguo licet avi et regionis spatio circumdata, tamen pingendi, sculpendi, scribendi numeros absolute explevit : caruisset etiam sua Laurentius ; cujus magnificentia incendebatur honesta ea ac pæne Atheniensis æmulatio, eximius ille præstantiæ et jugis fons : cujus prudentia, ad turbulentissimas populi factiones sedandas nata, nec socordiæ locus nec violentiæ relinquebatur. Sed cum patre suo periit patria : neque quisquam exinde ortus est, qui aut vindicare aut narrare potuit⁴ collapsæ fata et dedecus reipublicæ.

Venio tandem ad quartam ultimamque ætatem, quæ non unitantum arsisit populo, sed finitimas et situ et moribus regiones, Angliam Galliamque, divisit bello, certamine virtutis consociavit. Amplissima in utraque poetarum, heroum ; artificum parciore

¹ V. Tacit. Agric. 3. Shaftes. 1. 150.

² Harris' Phil. Inq. 3. 5. §19. 3. 10. 455.

³ Hume's Essays, 14.

⁴ Roscoe. 2. §11.

seges: quæ ut vigescebat prope simul, ita et simul prope marcescebat: quasi quidem ille, qui inter cives solet esse, sit etiam inter terras, consensus animorum mirabilisque sympathia. Atqui hic vereor, ne sacer quodammodo sim, ausus quippe lapidem movere, qui arctioribus hinc puto terminis, illinc latioribus, continuit huc usque auream Britanniae ætatem. Profecto multi et illustres viri, post depulsam Papæ ridiculam pariter ac crudelem impotentiam, subinde exitere: magni autem menses procedere incipiunt sub imperio primi, desinunt sub fuga alterius Jacobi: ex quo tempore nati sunt, quibus delectamur pauci; quem admiramur, planè nemo. Hanc inter tempestatem, armis motibusque, et, ut fatear, licentia occupatissimam, publicis se in tabulis inscripsit civem Scientia,¹ ac domicilium in urbe posuit; quin et comitem adjunxit Eloquentiam, quæ constituenta se republica orta, constituta videtur decessisse. Eam intelligo Eloquentiam, non qua tonabat, fulgurabat, miscebat Græciam Pericles; non qua Demosthenes ad quemcunque vellet habitum, tanquam machinatione aliqua, contorquebat audientes: non qua ad debellandum istum Romæ Philippum concitabat suos Cicero: sed sanctiorem quandam et diviniorem, religionis filiam, ministram fidei, cæli internunciam. Tunc etiam ad maturitatem nostra pervenit lingua: speciem præ se ferens virilem; toros exercitatione expressos; colorem succo et sanguine redundantem; generosam insuper circa munditias negligentiam. Trans-eunt profecto in colloquium transfuga hominum studia ac mores; et cum temporum conditione et diversitate aurium, forma quoque sermonis et species immutantur: unde evadit cultissima ea hodiernorum loquela, curiosiorque proprietatum anxietas, et multiplex frivolorum atque ornamentorum lascivia: concisis ac corruptis, quidquid veteres habuere roboris, quidquid vehementiæ, quidquid sanitatis. Quare inter omnia,² quæ declarant solem nobis occidisse, non minimum est, quod fastidientes, integerrimam Hookeri facundissimamque sapientiam; et, quæ ante omnes in Taylors apparent, facilem elocutionis magnificentiam, sententiasque modo tenceritate, modo sanctitate pollentes, præ his inquam patimur nosmet frigidis Humii meretriciisque argutiis deliniri; aut pingues Gibboni, fucatosque et mechanica quadam regula compositos periodos possumus admirari: quod denique apertam illorum et magnanimam Christianitatis defensionem avertitur, ut contueamur nimirum insidiosas

¹ Royal Society.

² Ἡδὲ γὰρ φράσσει πάντ' ἄλυσιν ἄρμαι διδύκειν. Theocr.

horum jaculationes, Parthicamque hostium militiam. Et quoniam aliquos audio, non bene tantummodo sentientes, sed et optime, de hisce nostris temporibus, circumspiciant velim ipsi pauca quædam languescantis, ut opinor, et deficientis sæculi indicia. Quis quæso non videt, præcipiti lapsu descitum jam esse a disciplina, ad libidines transcursum? quis negat, majorem haberi pecuniæ, quam excellentiæ auctoritatem; dum rationis relicta, perversam corporis gratiam gratificamur? Critici simus, grammatici, geometræ, historici, iique forsitan divini—Dii tamen minorum sumus gentium. Circa quoque opera, non, ut immortales antiquæ memoriæ pictores, quatuor¹ solis coloribus utimur; sed copia nos ipsa obruit: neque ut illi naturam, sed naturæ imitatores imitamur. Quod ad studia spectat, quis ignorat, tum existere illam nescio quo vocandam nomine² ingenii ἀρχήν, cum diversæ magni animi dotes in unius rei studium unice et separatim incumbunt; cum id toto pectore arripiunt, id solum agunt, id universum hauriunt. Hoc sane in prima ætate fieri non potest, propter necessarias vitæ curas; in tertia non solet, propter voluptarias. Desilit jam enim inconstans animus ab alia ad aliam materiam; seu desperat tentata præterire; et quod assequi nequit, desinit sequi; seu quod commune est, fastidit; et ejus, quod parabile est, satietate capitur; seu denique, ut ægri ardens stomachus solidum aversatur et simplicem cibum; et deliciarius egens, dubiæ sibi poscit condimenta cœnæ; sic tumultuaria³ cognitione et erudito luxu pascitur corrupta mens; neque fontem rerum amplius consecramur, sed rivulos cursim delibamus. Sic est profecto cum rebus hominum; quod rebus publicis facit mercatura, id ingenio doctrina; dum nutriunt, dum augent, hoc una sequitur, ut nutritæ, auctæ, dilabantur, evanescant. Sunt suæ igitur utrique columnæ, ultra quas progredi vetat naturæ ratio; est fatalis utrique lex, qua ad summum evectis fastigium, ibi diu consistere non licet.

Restat, Academici, ut patientia vestra paullo diutius abutar, dum deprompta sparsim argumenta,* ante oculos composita revoco. Quid itaque mirum, tam paucas mundi et ætates et regiones, singulari ingeniorum ubertate floruisse beatissimas: cum ad hanc rem tot mille facultatum desiderantur, tot mille impediunt molestiarum. Concurrant⁴ enim necesse est in medio adolescentium animi, morum, linguæ, spatii, libertas,

¹ Plin. N. H.

² V. Johnson's *Life of Cowley*. p. 2. Ferguson, 4. 1. 303.

³ Shaftes. 1. 238.

⁴ Ferguson. 3. 8. 296.

commercium, imitatio, agitatio : quæ porro per se singula, sint propria ; inter se omnia, justo quodam temperamento misceantur oportet : abeant autem contraria hisce aut dissimilia. Quod si veræ habeantur, quas excussi rationes, nullam protenus in nostra vel Occidentalis Indiæ, vel Orientalis ditione, expectare datur summæ virtutis claritudinem : spes tamen aliqua subest, miserri-
mos Africæ populos aliquando tandem e mortua, quod aiunt, vita erumpentes, fore se ostensuros, non ad violentiæ lædissimam aut mercaturæ servitutem natos, sed ad suas legitimasque gloriæ et humanitatis partes sistinendas. Spes etiam certior nos tenet, utcumque ab artium laude ac poeseos sinus degeneres, ad scientiarum plenitudinem jam adhuc progredi, adhuc progres-
suros : utcumque a superbissima cognitionis luce delapsi, ad pristinas ignorantiae tenebras non posse retro referri. Per enim typographiam, et ærearum tabularum picturas, nova rerum apparet facies, major ordo nascitur ; per ea, quidquid magni unquam viri, docuere, scripsere, fecere, prope dixeram cogita-
vere ; quidquid Natura in se habet aut habuit videndum, cognoscendum, hoc omne traditum accepimus, mobile, perpetuum. Frustra igitur Luxuries ingenium, ut Herculaneum Vesuvius, divitiarum diluvio rursus obruet ; frustra belli furor, combusto alterius Alexandriæ templo, illo toto igne et vocem clarissimorum scriptorum, et memoriam, et totius orbis conscientiam abolere poterit : frustra¹ tyrannorum impotentia, expulsis iterum sapien-
tiæ professoribus, omnique bona arte in exilium acta, id efficiet, ut ne quid usquam honestum occurrat : Jam enim quisque, ut Ulysses ille, cum mortuis habet commercium ; librisque, tan-
quam heroum imaginibus, interest ; et suam singulos poscit historiam, et præterita revocat, et futura consulit—neque timet interea ne Gorgoneum² caput Superstitionis plura quæsituto superveniat. Porro, quod spe sibi gratulabatur olim Socrates,³ post mortem ipsi eventurum, id nobis jam in vita contigit, ut scilicet cum Homero, cum Virgilio, cum Tassone, cum Boi-
lavio, cum Milto, cum Shakespeario colloquamur ; ut tecum, mortalium maxime, Britannorum ultime, ut tecum, Newton, conversemur : cujus oculus universæ mundi naturæ concentricus, omnes suo in puncto concurrentes Scientiæ radios accepit ; qui cum innumerabiles cœli motus conversionesque animo vidisti, tum docuisti tuum ejus esse animum, qui ea fabricatus est in cœlo.

Coll. S. S. Trin. ap. Cantabrigienses.

H. V. B.

MDCCCII.

¹ V. Tacit. Agric. 2.

² Hom. Odyss. xi.

³ Plato. Apolog.

Important Discovery of the Original of many of the Sentences of Sextus Pythagoricus, which have been hitherto supposed to be alone extant in the fraudulent Version of the Presbyter Ruffinus.

ANY thing written by Porphyry must always be deemed invaluable by every lover of antiquity, and particularly by the student of the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle, as he was no less distinguished for his uncommon proficiency in that philosophy, than for the profundity of his erudition. Hence it is justly said of him by Eunapius,¹ "that, being let down to men, like a Mercurial chain, he unfolded, through his various erudition, every thing into perspicuity and purity;" and by Simplicius, "that he was the most learned of the philosophers."

Great praise, therefore, is due to the editor for the publication of the Epistle of Porphyry to Marcella;² but, as he has taken no notice of the sources whence most of the beautiful moral sentences with which this epistle abounds, are derived, it becomes necessary to unfold them to the reader, particularly as by this mean, several of the sentences of Sextus Pythagoricus, which have been only published in the fraudulent Latin version of the Presbyter Ruffinus, may be obtained in the original Greek.

Previous, however, to this developement, I shall present the reader with the emendation of the following defective sentence in p. 19: Τα δε πεπαιδευθαι ουκ εν πολυμαθειας αναληψει * * * * παλαξει δε των ψυχικων παθων εθεωρειτο. The editor not being an adept in the philosophy of Pythagoras and Plato, conceived that παλαξει was a genuine word; for he remarks, "Nota vocabulum παλαξις," whereas it is only a part of a word, i. e. it is a part of απαλλαξει. Hence, if after αναληψει, the words εν απαλλαξει are inserted, the sentence will be perfect, both in its construction and meaning, and will be in English, "Erudition does not consist in the resumption of polymathy, but is to be surveyed in a liberation from the psychical passions." The editor, not perceiving the necessity of this emendation, has, by the following version, totally mistaken the meaning of the sentence: "Bonam

¹ Ο δε Πορφυριος ωσπερ Ερμιακή τις σειρα και προς ανθρωπους ιπικνευουσα, δια ποικιλης παιδειας παντα εις το ευγνωστον και καθαρον ιξηγγιλιεν.

² This epistle was published by Angelus Maius, Mediolani 1816, 8vo.

autem institutionem nunquam æstiniem, quæ cum eruditionis copia, animalium quoque passionum contaminatione sordescat."

The first sentence, of which I have discovered the source, is from Sextus, and is the following, in p. 23: Θεος μὲν γὰρ δειτὰι οὐδένος· σοφὸς δὲ μόνου θεοῦ: i. e. "For God is not in want of any thing; but the wise man is alone in want of God." This, in the version of Ruffinus, is: "Deus quidem nullius eget, fidelis autem Dei solius." (Vid. Opusc. Mytholog. 8vo. 1688, p. 646.)

2. Πᾶσης πράξεως καὶ παντὸς ἐργοῦ καὶ λόγου θεὸς ἐποπτῆς παρῆστω καὶ ἐφορὸς (p. 24.): i. e. "Of every action, and of every deed and word, God is present as the scrutator and inspector." This is evidently derived from the following sentence of Demophilus, (Opusc. Mythol. p. 621.): Ἐὰν αἰ μνημονεύῃς, ὅτι οὐκοῦν ἂν ἡ ψυχὴ σου, καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἐργὸν ἀποτελεῖ, θεὸς ἐφῆσθηκεν ἐφορὸς, ἐν πάσαις σου ταῖς εὐχαῖς καὶ πράξεσιν, αἰδεσθήσῃ μὲν τοῦ θεωροῦ τὸ ἀληθινόν, εἴῃς δὲ τὸν θεὸν συνοικόν. i. e. "If you always remember, that, wherever your soul, or your body, performs any deed, God is present as an inspector, in all your prayers and actions, you will reverence the nature of an Inspector from whom nothing can be concealed, and will have God for a cohabitant." What immediately follows in this paragraph, is from Sextus, viz. καὶ παντῶν ὧν πράττομεν ἀγαθῶν τὸν θεὸν αἰτίον ἡγαμέθα: i. e. "Of all the good that we do, we should consider God as the cause." And Sextus says, p. 648: "Deus in bonis actibus hominis dux est." Porphyry adds: Τῶν δὲ κακῶν αἰτίοι ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν οἱ βλομενοὶ· θεὸς δὲ ἀναίτιος. And the latter part is evidently from Sextus, who says, p. 648, "Mali nullius autor est Deus." Porphyry further adds, Ὅθεν καὶ εὐκταίον τὰ ἀξία θεοῦ· καὶ αἰτωμέθα ἂν μὴ λαβοίμεν ἂν παρ' ἑτέρου· καὶ ὧν ἡγεμονες οἱ μετ' ἀρετῆς πονοῖ, ταῦτα εὐχομέθα γενέσθαι μετὰ τοὺς πόνους: i. e. "Hence we should ask of God things which are worthy of him, and which we cannot receive from any other. The goods also, of which labors are the leaders, in conjunction with virtue, we should pray that we may obtain after the labors [are accomplished]." All this is from Sextus. For, in p. 648, he says: "Hæc posce a Deo, quæ dignum est præstare Deum. Eæ pete a Deo, quæ accipere ab homine non potes. In quibus præcedere debet labor, hæc tibi opta evenire post laborem." Only in this last sentence, Ruffinus has omitted to add after *labor*, the words *cum virtute*. What Porphyry says, almost immediately after this, is precisely the first of the sentences of Demophilus, (Opusc. Mythol. p. 626,) viz. Ἄ δε κτησαμενος οὐ καθεξῆς, μὴ αἰτοῦ παρὰ θεοῦ· ὧρον γὰρ θεοῦ παν· ἀναφαιρετόν· ὥστε οὐ δώσει ὁ μὴ καθεξῆς: i. e. "Do

not ask of God that which, when you have obtained, you cannot preserve. For every gift of God is incapable of being taken away; so that he will not give that which you cannot retain." The sentence immediately following this, is ascribed to Pythagoras, and is to be found in the sentences of Stobæus, (edit. 1609, p. 65,) viz. *Ὡν δὲ τοῦ σώματος ἀπαλλαγείσα οὐ βεβήσῃ, ἐκείνων καταφρονεῖ· καὶ ὧν ἂν ἀπαλλαγείσα δεῖ, εἰς ταῦτα σὺ ἀσκούμενη τὸν θεὸν παρεκάλει γενεσθαι συλληπτορα.* In Stobæus, however, there is some difference, so as to render the sentence more complete. For immediately after *καταφρονεῖ* there is *παντῶν*; for *βεβήσῃ* there is *δεῖσῃ*; for *δεῖ*, *δεῖσῃ*; for *τὸν θεόν*, *τούς θεούς*; for *σὺ ἀσκούμενη*, *σοὶ ἀσκούμενω*; and instead of *γενεσθαι συλληπτορα*, *γενεσθαι σοὶ συλληπτορα.* This, therefore, translated, will be: "Despise all those things which, when liberated from the body, you will not want; and, exercising yourself in those things, of which, when liberated from the body, you will be in want, invoke the Gods to become your helpers." In p. 27 and 28, Porphyry says, *αἰρετωτέρου σοὶ ὄντος [χρημάτων] εἰκὴ βαλεῖν ἢ λόγον· καὶ τὸ ἡττασθαι τ' ἀληθὲ λέγοντα, ἢ νικᾶν ἀπατώντα*, i. e. "It should be more eligible to you, carelessly to throw away riches than reason; and to be vanquished when speaking the truth, than to vanquish by deception." And the latter part of this sentence is to be found in Sextus: for in p. 649 he says: "*Melius est vinci vera dicentem, quam vincere mentientem.*" Almost immediately after Porphyry adds, *Ἀδύνατον τὸν αὐτὸν φιλεῖν τε εἶναι καὶ φιληδονοῦν καὶ φιλοσωματόν· ὁ γὰρ φιληδόνος καὶ φιλοσωματος, παντὶ καὶ φιλοχρηματος· ὁ δὲ φιλοχρηματος, ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἀδίκος· ὁ δὲ ἀδίκος, καὶ εἰς θεὸν καὶ εἰς πατέρα ἀνοσίος, καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἄλλους παρανομός· ὥστε καὶ ἑκατομβας θυῇ, καὶ μυριοῖς ἀναθήμασι νέως ἀγαλλῇ, ἀτεβῆς ἐστὶ καὶ ἀθεός· καὶ τῇ προαιρεσεὶ ἱεροσυλός· διὸ καὶ πάντα φιλοσωματοῦ ὡς ἀθεὸν καὶ μικρὸν ἐντρέπεσθαι χρή.* This sentence is the last of the sentences of Demophilus (Opusc. Mythol. p. 625); but in Porphyry, it is in one part defective, and in another is fuller than in Demophilus. For in the first colon, *φιλοχρηματοῦ* is wanting. In the second colon, after *ὁ γὰρ φιληδόνος καὶ φιλοσωματος*, the words *ὁ δὲ φιλοσωματος* are wanting. And in Demophilus, instead of *ὁ δὲ ἀδίκος, καὶ εἰς θεὸν καὶ εἰς πατέρα ἀνοσίος, καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἄλλους παρανομός*, there is nothing more than, *ὁ δὲ ἀδίκος, εἰς μὲν θεὸν ἀνοσίος, εἰς δὲ ἀνθρώπους παρανομός.* In Demophilus, also, after *ὥστε καὶ ἑκατομβας θυῇ*, the words *καὶ μυριοῖς ἀναθήμασι νέως ἀγαλλῇ*, are wanting. And in Porphyry, after *νέως ἀγαλλῇ*, the words *πολυ μᾶλλον ἀνοσιώτερος ἐστὶ, καὶ*, are wanting. This sentence therefore, thus amended, will be in English, "It is impossible for the same person to be a lover of God, a lover of

pleasure, a lover of body, and a lover of riches. For a lover of pleasure is also a lover of body; but a lover of body is entirely a lover of riches; and a lover of riches is necessarily unjust. But he who is unjust, is impious towards God and his parents, and lawless towards others. So that, though he should sacrifice hecatombs, and adorn temples with ten thousand gifts, he will be much more unholy, impious, atheistical, and sacrilegious in his deliberate choice. Hence it is necessary to avoid every lover of body, as one who is without God, and is defiled."

3. The following passages in the epistle of Porphyry, are from Sextus: *Ο δε αξιος ανθρωπος θεου, θεος αν ειη*, (p. 30,) i. e. "The man who is worthy of God will be himself a god." And Sextus says, "*Dignus Deo homo, deus est et in hominibus*," (p. 654.) Porphyry says, *Και τιμησεις μεν αριστα τον θεον, οταν τω θεω την σαυτης διανοιαν ομοιωσεις*, (p. 30.) i. e. "And you will honor God in the best manner, when you assimilate your reasoning power to God." Thus also Sextus, "*Optime honorat Deum ille, qui mentem suam, quantum fieri potest, similem Deo facit*," (p. 655.) Again, Porphyry says, *Θεος δε ανθρωπον βεβαιον πρασσοντα καλα κακων δε πραξεων κακος δαιμων ηγεμων*, (p. 31.) i. e. "God corroborates man when he performs beautiful deeds; but an evil dæmon is the leader of bad actions." And Sextus says, "*Deus bonos actus hominum confirmat. Malorum actuum, malus dæmon dux est*," (p. 653.) Porphyry adds, *Ψυχη δε σοφου αρμοζεται προς θεον, αι θεον ορα, συνεστιν αι θεω*, (p. 31.) i. e. "The soul of the wise man is adapted to God; it always beholds God, and is always present with God." Thus, too, Sextus, "*Sapientis anima audit Deum, sapientis anima aptatur a Deo, sapientis anima semper est cum Deo*," (p. 655.) There is, however, some difference between the original and the Latin version, which is most probably owing to the fraud of Ruffinus. And in the last place, Porphyry says, *Αλλα κρηπις ευσεβειας σοι νομιζεσθω η φιλανθρωπια*, (p. 58,) i. e. "Philanthropy should be considered by you as the foundation of piety." And Sextus says, "*Fundamentum et initium est cultus Dei, amare Dei homines*," (p. 654.) Ruffinus, however, in this version, fraudulently translates *φιλανθρωπια*, *amare Dei homines*, in order that this sentence, as well as the others, might appear to be written by Sixtus the bishop.

4. The learned reader will find the following passages in the epistle of Porphyry, to be sentences of Demophilus, viz. *Λογον γαρ θεου τοις υπο δοξης διεφθαρμεναις λεγειν, κ. τ. λ. usque ad, ισον φερει*, (p. 29.) *Ουχ η γλωττα του σοφου τιμιον παρα θεω, κ. τ. λ. usque ad, μονος ειδως ευξασθαι*, (p. 32.) *Ου χαλωθεντες ουν οι θεοι*

βλαπτουσι, κ. τ. λ. usque ad, θεω δε ουδεν αβουλητον, (p. 35.) Ουτε δακρυα και ικετεiai θεον επιστρεφουσι, ουτε θυπολια θεον τιμωσιν, ουτε αναθηματων πληθος κοσμουσι θεον, κ. τ. λ. usque ad, ιεροσυλοις χρηγια, (p. 36.) In which passage, however, there is a remarkable difference, as the learned reader will find, between the text of Porphyry, and that of Demophilus. Εαν ουν αι μνημονευης, οτι οπου αν η ψυχη σου περιπατη, και το σωμα ενεργον (lege εργον) αποτελη, κ. τ. λ. usque ad τον θεον συνωικον, (p. 37.) Ο συνετος ανηρ και θεοφιλης, κ. τ. λ. usque ad σπουδαζεται πονησας, (p. 54.) Γυμνος δε αποσταλεις [σοφος] κ. τ. λ. usque ad επηκοος ο θεος, (p. 54.) Χαλεπωτερον δουλευειν παθειςιν η τυραννοις. And οσα γαρ παθη ψυχης, τοσουτοι και ωμοι δεσποται, (p. 57.) And lastly, πολλω γαρ κρειττον τεθναι η δι' ακρασιαν την ψυχην αμαυρωσαι, (p. 58.) In all these passages, the learned reader will find, by comparing them with Porphyry that they occasionally differ from the text of Demophilus, yet not so as to alter the sense.

I only add, that the learned reader will also find many of the sentences of Demophilus among those of Sextus; and that this is not at all wonderful, as it was usual with the Pythagoreans, from their exalted notions of friendship, to consider the work of one of them as the production of all.

T. TAYLOR.

NOTICE OF

Researches in Greece, by WILLIAM MARTIN-LEAKE.
London, Booth, 4to. pp. 472.

THIS Volume, we learn by the préface, is to be considered as the first part of future observations, which the author intends to publish in one or two additional Parts. The next Part is to exhibit a comparative view of the ancient and modern Geography of Greece, illustrated by a delineation of the country. The publication before us comprises a Grammar of the modern Greek Language, and of the Albanian and Tzakonic dialects, besides what the author calls Pentagloss Exercises in the Wallachian and Bulgarian dialects; the phrases of those two idioms being associated with corresponding terms in Albanian,

in Romaic or modern Greek, and in English. The book also presents criticisms on modern Greek Literature, accompanied with extracts, and remarks on the pronunciation, &c. of the modern Greeks, with an outline of Albanian, Wallachian, and Bulgarian History.

A large portion of the work is occupied with grammatical details and vocabularies.

The fifth section of the first chapter, is of superior value to most others in the work. It comprehends remarks on the pronunciation of the modern Greeks—on the letters of the alphabet—on accent—and general observations upon their education, literature, &c. The writer professes to do this, without presuming to enter into the difficult question respecting accent and quantity, which has long occupied and eluded the researches of so many of the learned; but particularly of Mr. Mitford, the learned historian of Greece, and the author of the “*Inquiry into the Principles of Harmony in Language*,” a truly excellent work, which we feel pleasure in recommending, on this occasion, to the literary cabinet of every English scholar.

The pronunciation of Hellenic, whether prose or verse, is regulated, like the speech of the modern Greeks, solely by accent; but they have a kind of cadence in reciting, which is evidently derived from the mode of chanting in the Greek church, and has been taught them in their youth by the priests who keep the grammar schools.

Mr. Mitford has proved that accent, and not quantity, is the regulator of harmony in Greek and Latin poetry, according to our mode of reading it. For instance, an hexameter verse is read by us, as if it were a verse of five feet of the triple rhythmus, indicated by the arrangement of accents. Thus an hexameter verse has five strong accents; the three former either on long or short syllables; the two last on syllables prosodically long. The harmony of Latin verse, therefore, is not determined by quantity, but by the same species of accent which creates the harmony of Italian, English, or Spanish poetry.

The Latin versification is in great degree susceptible of the accentual harmony of modern European languages, though it is framed on very different laws; because its rules of accentuation are very simple, and approximate to our own; but as the accents of Greek words are referred to other principles, they very frequently interfere with our method of reading, and in consequence are unduly depreciated.

“At present there are very few Greeks, even of those who

can understand and admire the poetry of the ancients, that have any familiar knowledge of the rules by which it is constructed. If learnt, they are soon forgotten, for the same reason that accents are neglected among us. We are negligent of Greek accents, because they interfere with quantity; and the modern Greeks are inattentive to the laws of syllabic quantity, because they interfere with accent. If the Greeks should ever become more familiar with Latin literature, which they despised when they were independent, and under their present oppression have not the means of acquiring, they might perhaps in time adopt the same method of reading Greek verse that we now employ. The only modern Greek I ever met with, who had acquired this habit, had been educated in Italy, and was a very good Latin scholar; but he seemed perfectly sensible that it was not the true ancient method of reciting Greek poetry. I have known modern Greeks, who had a perfect familiarity with the best writers among their ancestors, and in many cases that superior feeling of them, which it is natural to expect in men still speaking a dialect of the same language, but who never bestowed a thought upon ancient prosody, who made the same objection which an Englishman would make, to the exact observance of quantity in the recitation of verse, namely, that it would often divide the words, and render them unintelligible to the hearer; and in short, who could not at all comprehend the kind of harmony we give to Greek verse, by applying Latin accent to it."

"That we should be able, in reading Hellenic compositions, in verse or prose, to adhere to modern Greek accent, and at the same time to give them a sound perfectly harmonious to our own ears, formed as they are to the very different laws of poetical harmony, inherent in all the modern languages derived from the Teutonic and Slavonian, seems extremely difficult in practice: but the attempt is well worthy the attention of scholars, and must be materially assisted in its success by the remarks of the two writers already referred to." [i. e. Mr. Knight and Mr. Mitford].

"The right pronunciation of the letters of the Greek alphabet, is a question quite distinct from that of the reconciling of accent with quantity."

The author then remarks on the different vowels and accents of the modern Greeks, and enters into discussion on the comparative expediency of ancient and modern Greek accent. He seems disposed to recommend the adoption both of the accent and the pronunciation of the modern Greeks; and to think that

they have in general retained the accent of their ancestors, though he is rather indeterminate on this subject. He observes,

"If it be admitted that the mode of accentuation, as observed in reading Greek in our schools, is that of the ancients, we must also conclude, that the descendants of a people, who have been less mixed with foreigners than any other nation of the South of Europe, and still inhabit the same countries, where the names of places have in many instances continued to be the same, from the most distant ages of which we have any historical knowledge, have entirely altered and disfigured those names, in giving, for instance, the sound of *Λάρισσα*, "*Ελυμπος* or "*Ολυμπος*, "*Εγριπος* or *Εύριπος*, *Κάρυστος*, *Κόρινθος*, *Οινόη*, *Καλιρρόη*, "*Επίδαυρος*, *Κηφισιά*, with the tone upon the accented syllable,¹ to the places formerly called *Λαρίσσα*, "*Ολύμπος*, *Εύρίπος*, *Καρύστος*, *Κορίνθος*, *Οίονη*, *Καλίρροη*, "*Επιδάυρος*, *Κηφισσία*, with the accent upon the long syllables—and it is so much the more unnecessary to make this violent supposition, as we have an easy and natural mode of accounting for the rise and progress of our own mode of pronouncing Greek, by tracing its accentuation to the Latin tongue."²

"It may even be remarked, that in tracing the vestiges of ancient names of places in Greece, (an inquiry very important to the geographer,) accent will generally be found the surest guide to identity. Letters and syllables are often lost, and vowels changed; but where any trace of the ancient name remains, the accent is generally the same as it always has been. Thus *Θαυμακχι* is now *Dhomokó*—"*Αλφειός*, *Rufiás*—*Ολοοσσών*, *-ώνος*, *Ελασίονα*—"*Ανάφλυστος*, *Anáfiso*—*Πεντέλη*, *Mendéli*—

¹ It is almost unnecessary here to repeat a remark, which has often been made upon this subject—that the elevation or depression of tone in a syllable, has not necessarily any thing to do with its quantity or extension; and that the accent on the first syllable of "*Ολυμπος* no more makes that syllable long in point of time, or the second syllable short, than the accent on the first syllable of our word *honestly*, makes that syllable long, or the second syllable short. It often occurs, indeed, that a person, in order to give greater emphasis to a word, *prolongs* the accented syllable, and in this manner makes a syllable, which in its nature is short, longer than one, which is naturally long. It is perhaps this tendency to prolong the accented syllable, derived from our barbarous ancestors, who corrupted the Latin and Greek, and introduced the accentual prosody, that forms the chief difficulty in the way of reconciling accent with quantity.

² Upon this subject the reader is once more referred to Mitford's Inquiry. Sect. 13.

'*Θάκη*, *Thiáki*, &c. &c. In Italy the same adherence to accent in names derived from the Greek, has already been remarked by Mr. Mitford,¹ in the instances of *Félope*, *Sofía*, *María*, *Táranto*, *Posilippo*, *Mónaco*, &c.; to which examples might be added those of *Calispéra*, *Calóghero*, and some others in Sicily."

"If modern accent be different from that of the ancients, it is necessary to fix some period, at which the change took place. It is generally admitted, that the notes called acute, grave, and circumflex, were in use two thousand years ago, to explain the pronunciation of Greek to foreigners; and we have an incontrovertible proof of the same accents now employed, having been in common use between seventeen and eighteen centuries ago,² in the verse of Euripides, found inscribed upon the wall of a street of Herculaneum, which was overwhelmed by an eruption of Mount Vesuvius, in the reign of Titus. There seems nothing left, therefore, for those, who maintain that the accentuation of the modern Greeks in speaking is different from that of the ancients, but to suppose, that the same notes formerly used to indicate some unknown laws of pronunciation were, in or about the ages which gave rise to the accentual prosody of the modern Greeks, applied to fix a new mode of accentuation then introduced. Whether this hypothesis can easily be maintained, must be left to the judgment of the reader.

"It must be confessed that, if we adopt modern accent, the metrical harmony of the ancients is not very easily explained; but as we are aware that our method of reading Greek verse does not depend upon quantity, but is regulated by a peculiar arrangement of accents, which we have borrowed from Latin verse of a similar structure, it cannot be asserted that it is the right mode of recitation: and it seems more important to adopt the modern Greek accent in common discourse, than, by sacrificing it for the sake of a kind of harmony in verse, which may be

¹ Harmony in Language, Sect. 15. Art. 6.

² *Pittura Antiche di Ercolano*, t. ii. p. 34. Napoli, 1760.

A fac-simile of this line may also be seen in Villoison's *Anecdota Græca*. Diatriba, p. 207.

The verse, Ὡς ἐν σοφὸν βούλευμα τὰς πολλὰς χεῖρας νικά, is quoted by Polybius, l. i. c. 35.

At Herculaneum, the words ἐν σοφὸν are improperly written ἐνσο φόν, and τως is not accented at all; but these are probably only the errors of an illiterate person.

widely different from that of the ancients, to render the language unintelligible to those, who still speak a dialect of it.

"A question has often arisen among those who have remarked the present state of the Greek tongue, and the affinity of the modern dialect to the parent language, so much nearer than that of the languages derived from Latin to their original speech, whether it would not be practicable for the Greeks, as they become more civilised, and better acquainted with the writings of the ancients, to abolish the Romaic dialect entirely, and revive Hellenic; and whether practicable or not, it certainly is not unreasonable to imagine, that, by giving an education exclusively Hellenic to the rising generation, the use of the vulgar speech might, in the course of time, be confined to the lower orders though not unintelligible to the higher, like the dialects of many parts of France and Italy. It may be conjectured, however, that their ignorance of ancient Greek music, and of the principles of ancient harmony, and the discordance of Greek and Latin accent, which would prevent the Greeks from adopting that kind of harmony, which we give to Greek verse, by the use of Latin accent, would be the chief obstacles. It might soon become common for the Greeks to speak and write their ancient language more fluently, elegantly, and correctly, than it has ever been done by the learned of the rest of Europe; but the vernacular tongue has contracted too close a resemblance to that of the nations with whom, in a more advanced stage of civilisation, the Greeks would have a constant intercourse, ever to become obsolete. It is to be feared, that the poetry of the ancient Greeks will not obtain all the credit it deserves with their living descendants, until these are masters of the true method of reciting it; and that while accent continues to be the only indicator of harmony among them, modern metre, and the jingle of rhyme, are likely to maintain their place. In such a case, therefore, if they cannot expel their modern dialect, its improvement ought to be a primary object with them; and it can hardly be doubted, that with the advantage it possesses of retaining a close affinity both with ancient Greek, and with the modern languages of Europe, and its consequent facility of receiving beauties from both, it might become equal, if not superior, to any modern European dialect."

We apprehend that the author, notwithstanding his note, p. 220, has not distinguished with sufficient explicitness between emphasis and accent. The modern Greeks, even when they retain the accent on the same syllable as their ancestors, employ it, as we conceive, merely to designate *ictus* or emphasis; and

it may be observed, that Major, now Colonel, LEAKE, throughout his book, in his references to modern Greek words, uses only the acute accent, as being competent for the purposes of the ancient acute, and grave, and circumflex.

MISCELLANEA CLASSICA.

NO. IX.

Continued from No. XLI. p. 22.

I. HOMER, in his account of the interview between Ulysses and Penelope, the former being yet in disguise, describes the suppressed emotion of the hero on witnessing the tears excited by his narration :

Ὡς τῆς τήκετο καλὰ παρήϊα δακρυρχειούσης,
 Κλαιούσης ἐὼν ἄνδρα παρήμενον· αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς
 θυμῷ μὲν γοώωσαν ἐὼν ἐλέαιγε γυναῖκα,
 Ὀφθαλμοὶ δ' ὥσεί κέρα ἔστασαν, ἥε σίδηρος,
 Ἀτρέμας ἐν βλεφάροισι· δόλω δ' ὄγε δάκρυα κεῦθεν.

Od. xix. 208.

This natural illustration has occurred to an old Spanish ballad-writer, (author of one, among several pieces of the kind, admirably translated in Blackwood's Magazine, No. xxxv.) in describing extreme old age :

An old woman cometh forth, when she hears the people cry ;
 Her hair is white as silver, like horn her glazed eye. p. 491.

II. Hom. Od. xxiv. 330 :

Οὐλὴν μὲν πρῶτον τήνδε φράσαι ὀφθαλμοῖσι,
 Τὴν ἐν Παρνησῷ μ' ἔλασεν σϋζ' λευκῷ ὀδόντι
 Οἰχόμενον· σὺ δέ με προΐεις καὶ πότνια μήτηρ
 Ἐς πατέρ' Αὐτόλυκον μητρὸς φίλον, ὅφρ' ἂν ἐλοίμην
 Δῶρα, κ. τ. λ.

Perhaps the last lines would be better pointed thus :

Οἰχόμενον, σὺ δέ με προΐεις καὶ πότνια μήτηρ,
 Ἐς πατέρ' Αὐτόλυκον, κ. τ. λ.

ἐς πατέρ' being supposed to pertain both to οἰχόμενον and προΐεις. There are several other passages in Homer of which the punctuation might possibly be altered with advantage, a similar con-

struction having been apparently intended. Some of these we may point out on a future occasion.

III. Eur. Iph. Aul. 599. Marklund.

Τὴν βασίλειαν δεξώμεθ' ὄχων
 • Ἀπο, μὴ σφαλερῶς ἐπὶ τὴν γαῖαν,
 Ἀγανῶς δὲ χερσίν, μαλακῇ γνώμῃ
 Μὴ ταρβήσῃ μοι νεωστὶ μολόν
 Τὸ κλεινὸν τέκνον Ἀγαμεμνόνιον.

"In v. 600. Male inseritur articulus, quem in hujusmodi locutionibus Tragici non usurpant.—Ut male conjecerit Marklandus ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. Legendum potius cum Heathio, ἐπὶ γαῖαν." C. J. B. Mus. Crit. t. i. p. 188. Could the difficulty arising from the short syllable *αν* at the end of the line be obviated, we might perhaps read τήνδ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν. It would have been a bad omen, had she stumbled on first setting foot upon Trojan ground.

IV. In the passage quoted from Homer's Hymn to Apollo by Thucydides, iii. 104. ὑμεῖς δ' εὖ μάλα πᾶσαι ὑποκρίνασθε ἀφῆμῶς, is the conjecture ὑποκρίνασθαι (the infinitive for the imperative) admissible?

V. Blomfield's translation of Matthiæ's Greek Grammar, Vol. i. p. 167. § 135. Catalogue of Comparatives and Superlatives, of which no positive is left: "ἥσσαν, neutr. ἥσσαν, &c. —ἥκιστα, improperly assigned to μικρὸς, from which it deviates in its signification; it means 'weaker.' Comp. § 130. Obs." (An error, for 131.) In the section referred to we read: "Ἡσσαν or ἥττων must have been formed from ἡμισίων for ἡμισυς. Yet the superlative ἥκιστα seems to indicate, that it is properly ἡκίων, from an unknown positive." Does not ἥκιστα correspond with the positive ἥκα, "slightly," "gently," (derived perhaps from the obsolete ἡκὺς, as ὥκα from ὥκὺς, whence also ἥκιστα)? Hom. II. xx. 438.

Ἡ ρὰ, καὶ ἀμπεπαλὼν προίει δόρυ, καὶ τόγ' Ἀθήνῃ
 Πνοιῇ Ἀχιλλῆος πάλιν ἔτραπε κυδαλίμοιο,
 Ἡκα μάλα ψύξασα.

We may take this opportunity of observing, that the valuable work, to which we have just referred, is not printed with the accuracy which might have been wished. We would instance a few errata: p. 155, l. 20, for *nom. sing.* read *nom. acc. sing.*; p. 156, l. 10; for πολλοὺν read πολλοῦ; p. 165, l. 12, for ὑπερος,

ἔπειτα; p. 166, l. 21, for "latter," "former;"¹ p. 173, l. 6, for *μαί, καί*; p. 176, l. 4, for § 139, § 140; p. 180, l. 11, for *ὁμοῖ, ὁμοίς*. Nor do we intend to depreciate the merits of the translation, when we remark that there is an occasional uncouthness in the style.

VI. Additional metrical line. Thuc. ii. 22. *στάσεως ἐκείνους*
ἐκ δὲ Φαρσάλου, Μένων.

VII. The passage of Statius, quoted in p. 28. of the last Class. Journ. (Art. 10), has been imitated also by Jonson in his *Catiline*: describing the battle in which that traitor lost his life, he says:

———— The furies stood on hills,
Circling the place, and trembling to see men
Do more than they; while pity left the field, &c.

The latter idea seems also to be adopted from the same passage of Statius. *Ib.* l. 8, for iv. read iii.

VIII. Homer (*Il.* xvii. 434.) describing the grief testified by the horses of Patroclus for the death of their master, says:

——— "Ὅστε στήλη μένει ἔμπεδον, ἥτ' ἐπὶ τύμβῳ
'Ανέρος εἰστήκει τεθνηῆτος, ἥε γυναικός"
'Ὡς μένον ἀσφαλέως περικαλλέα δίφροι ἔχοντες,—

Hence Glover in his *Leonidas*: (Book ix.)

———— As a marble form
Fix'd on the solemn sepulchre, inclines
The silent head in imitated woe
O'er some dead hero, whom his country lov'd;
Entranc'd by anguish, o'er the breathless clay,
So hung the princess.

Coleridge, in a fine allegoric vision prefixed to his second *Lay Sermon*, has fallen upon a similar expressive image: he compares a figure seated in silent abstraction, to "an emblem on a rich man's sepulchre."

IX. Mitford, Vol. i. p. 161. "The combat of the chiefs, so repeatedly described by Homer, advancing to engage singly

¹ We recollect a similar instance in another Grammar, the word *last* put for *first*. This was owing, as no doubt in the present case, to an accident in the press work.—ED.

in front of their line of battle, is apt to strike a modern reader with an appearance of absurdity much beyond the reality. Before the use of fire-arms, that practice was not uncommon, when the art of war was at its greatest perfection. Cæsar himself gives, with evident satisfaction, a very particular account of a remarkable advanced combat, in which, not generals indeed, but two centurions of his army engaged. The glory attached at Rome to the acquisition of the *spolia opima* might have been still more appositely mentioned here.

X. To the passage quoted from Lord Byron as parallel to Virgil's description of Mount Atlas, in Misc. Class. No. viii. (C. J. No. xli. pp. 25, 26.) add the following from Montgomery's Greenland, which we think not unworthy of being associated with the others. He is describing an Icelandic mountain.

Of Alpine height and mould
Schapta's unshaken battlements behold ;
• His throne an hundred hills ; his sun-crown'd head
Resting on clouds ; his robe of shadow spread
• • O'er half the isle ; he pours from either hand
An unexhausted river through the land.

Campbell's well-known picture may also be quoted.

— On Atlantic waves he rides afar,
Where Andes, giant of the western star,
With meteor-standard to the winds unfurl'd,
Looks from his throne of clouds on half the world.

Dr. Symmons's translation of the passage of Virgil is worth subjoining :

— In his flight he sees great Atlas rise—
Gigantic Atlas, on whose piny brow
Beat ceaseless winds, and gathering winters blow :
Snows veil his shoulders ; from his chin descends
The rush of floods ; in ice his beard depends.

iv. 309.

XI. To Mitford's conjectures (Vol. ix. p. 178, &c.) concerning the family and government of Pharnabazus, it may be added, that Herodotus (passim) and Thucydides (i. 129.) mention an Artabazus, son of Pharnaces, in the time of Xerxes, the latter as satrap of Dascylium ; that Pharnaces son of Pharnabazus is mentioned Thuc. ii. 67, in circumstances apparently demou-

strating a connexion with the family of Mr. Mitford's favorite hero; and that the terms of the treaty recorded in Thuc. viii. 58, ξυνθήκαι ἐγένοντο Δακεδαιμονίων καὶ τῶν ξυμμάχων πρὸς Τισσαφέρνην καὶ Ἰεραμένην, καὶ τοὺς Φαρνάκου παῖδας, bear no unfavorable aspect on some of the historian's speculations. The subject is scarcely worth pursuing, or perhaps other arguments might be found. Possibly, the origin of the great Mithridates might be traced to the same family.—We are not satisfied with Mr. Mitford's substitution of Polydamas for Polyaces, (ix. p. 79.) nor with some of his strictures on the *democratical* commentators.

CÆCILIUS METELLUS.

CORRECTIONS

In the common Translation of the New Testament.

No. v.

* * I venture to continue these remarks from No. XXXII. of the Classical Journal. They are intended to prove that, although the expediency of a revision of the Common Translation is apparent, the necessary corrections are much fewer, and less important, than some of the advocates for a new Translation have asserted. C. P.

ACTS of the APOSTLES.

CHAPTER I. v. 1. *of, on.*

v. 2. *After that he, through the Holy Ghost, had given commandments to the Apostles, whom he had chosen, when he had given to the Apostles, whom he had chosen, directions for what they were to perform through the Holy Ghost.*

v. 4. *Which, saith he, ye, which you.* (The addition in the common translation destroys the beautiful *Conversion* mentioned by Longinus. §. 27.)

v. 6. *restore again, restore.*

v. 11. *which also, who* (et passim).

v. 14. *and Mary, particularly Mary.*

v. 15. *and said, (the number of the names together were about 120), whose number was about 120, and said.*

v. 20. *bishoprick, office.*

v. 21. *which have companied with us*, who have accompanied us.

—*went in and out among us*, was conversant among us.

CH. II. v. 3. *cloven tongues like us of fire, and it sat*, tongues as of fire, distributed and sitting.

v. 4. *with other*, in different.

v. 8. *man in*, man speaking in.

v. 20. *notable*, illustrious.

v. 22. *approved*, distinguished.

v. 27. *in hell*, in the place of the dead.

v. 41. *were added unto them*, were added.

v. 47. *such as should be saved*, those who were saved (alluding to σωθητε, v. 40).

CH. III. v. 2. *whom they*, who was.

v. 3. *an alms*, alms of them.

v. 13. *denied him*, denied.

v. 16. *by him*, in Jesus.

v. 17. *wot*, know (et passim).

v. 18. *But——fulfilled*, But God has thus fulfilled those things, which he had before shown by the mouth of all his Prophets, that Christ should suffer.

CH. IV. v. 1. *Captain*, Captain of the guard.

v. 4. *which heard the word*, who had heard the discourse.

v. 7. *them*, Peter and John.

v. 13. *took knowledge of them*, knew.

v. 21. *finding nothing*, not finding.

v. 24. *when they*, when the other Apostles.

v. 34. *any among them that lacked*, any poor among them.

CH. V. v. 9. *tempt*, provoke.

v. 12. *And by the hands of the Apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people, and they*, and many signs and wonders were wrought among the people by the Apostles, who.

v. 15. *overshadow*, cover.

v. 24. *doubted of them whereunto this would grow*, wondered how this could have happened.

v. 26. *for they feared the people, lest they should be stoned*, for they were afraid of being stoned by the people.

v. 34. *to put the Apostles forth a little space*, that the Apostles should withdraw for a short time.

v. 40. *to*, with.

CH. VI. v. 2. *reason*, reasonable.—*serve tables*, attend to the distributions.

v. 6. *and when they had prayed, they laid*, who, having prayed, laid.

v. 14. *us*, to *us*.

CH. VII. v. 2. *he said*, Stephen said.—*Men, brethren, Brethren.*

v. 4. *he removed*, God removed.

v. 5. *and he*, He.

v. 10. *and he*, who.

v. 23. *it came into his heart*, he resolved.

v. 26. *set them at one again*, reconciled them.

v. 37. *like unto me*, as he has raised up me.

v. 38. *the lively oracles*, the words of life.

v. 39. *to whom*, whom.

v. 44. *as he had appointed, speaking unto Moses, that he should*, as God had appointed, in ordering Moses to.

v. 45. *Jesus*, Joshua.

v. 59. *calling upon God*, calling upon.

CH. VIII. v. 3. *haling*, dragging.

v. 4. *therefore*, but.

v. 5. *the*, a.

v. 9. *giving out that himself was some great one*, pretending to be a wonderful man.

v. 15. *for them*, for the Samaritans.

v. 17. *Then laid they*, then the Apostles laid.

v. 38. *both Philip*, Philip.

CH. IX. v. 2. *to Damascus to the Synagogues*, to the Synagogues of Damascus.

v. 7. *stood*, remained.—*way*, sent.

v. 8. *when his eyes were opened*, although his eyes were open.

v. 15. *a chosen vessel*, a choice instrument.

v. 20. *Christ*, Jesus.

v. 26. *assayed*, attempted.

v. 27. *and that he*, who.

CH. X. v. 22. *words of thee*, thy instructions.

v. 35. *accepted with him*, acceptable to him.

v. 40. *showed him*, showed.

v. 46. *with tongues*, in different languages.

CH. XI. v. 1. *had also*, also had.

v. 4. *rehearsed*, related.—*by*, in.

v. 5. *descend*, descending.

v. 6. *Upon the which when I had fastened my eyes, I considered, and*, Having attentively examined it, I.

v. 13. *and he showed us how*, who informed us that.

v. 15. *I began to speak*, I was speaking.

v. 18. *also to the Gentiles*, to the Gentiles also.

v. 19. *about*, after.

v. 23. *that with purpose of heart they would*, firmly to.

CH. XII. v. 4. *Easter*, the Passover.

v. 9. *him*, the Angel.—*wist not that it was true*, which was done by the Angel, knew not that what was done by the Angel was real.

v. 11. *of a surety*, with certainty.

v. 16. *saw*, seen.

v. 20. *was highly displeased with them of Tyre and Sidon*, meditated war against the Tyrians and Sidonians.

v. 23. *eaten of worms*, and gave up the ghost, consumed by worms, and died.

v. 25. *ministry*, commission.

CH. XIII. v. 9. *also is called*, is called also.

v. 15. *say on*, speak.

v. 27. *him not*, not Jesus.—*voices*, words.—*they have*, have.

v. 48. *ordained*, disposed.

CH. XIV. v. 5. *of the Gentiles*, and also of, by the Gentiles and by.

v. 13. *which*, whose temple.—*done*, offered.

v. 23. *ordained them elders*, ordained elders over them.

v. 27. *with them*, through them.

CH. XV. v. 2. *they*, it was.—*other of them*, others.

v. 4. *with them*, through them.

v. 5. *which believed*, who had embraced the Christian faith.

v. 7. *among us*, of us.

v. 12. *and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul declaring*, and heard Barnabas and Paul declare.

v. 31. *when they*, when the Christian converts.

v. 33. *a space*, they were let go, some time, they departed.

v. 38. *to take him with them*, who departed, to take with them one, who had departed.

CH. XVI. v. 1. *Place the Son*—to Greek in a parenthesis.

v. 10. *assuredly gathering*, concluding.

v. 14. *whose heart the Lord opened*, the Lord opened her heart.

v. 16. *met us*, which brought her masters much gain by sooth-saying, which brought her masters much gain by soothsaying, met us.

v. 17. *The same followed Peter and us*, and cried, saying, As she followed Paul and us, she cried out.

v. 22. *rent off their clothes*, and commanded to beat them, commanded them to be stripped and scourged.

v. 33. *baptized*, he and all his, straightway, immediately baptized with all his household.

v. 37. *nay verily*, no truly.

CH. XVII. v. 5. *lewd*, idle.—*company*, crowd.

v. 8. *and they troubled the people and the rulers of the city*, and the people and the rulers of the city were troubled.

v. 11. *noble*, ingenuous.

v. 14. *as it were to*, as if towards.

v. 19. *unto*, to the court of.

v. 22. *too superstitious*, very religious.

v. 23. *your devotion*, the objects of your worship.

v. 24. *seeing that he is*, being.

v. 26. *and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation*, having fixed the appointed times, and the boundaries of their habitation.

v. 30. *winked at*, overlooked.

v. 34. *among the which was*, as.

CH. XVIII. v. 6. *clean*, clear of it.

v. 7. *a certain man's house*, the house of a man.—*joined hard to*, was near.

v. 14. *wrong or wicked lewdness*, injustice or wicked propensity.

v. 26. *whom when Aquila and Priscilla had heard*, when Aquila and Priscilla had heard him.

v. 28. *Christ*, the Messiah.

CH. XIX. v. 2. *whether there be any Holy Ghost*, that the Holy Ghost is given.

v. 3. *into*, with.

v. 8. *disputing*, discussing.

v. 9. *divers*, many.—*way*, doctrine.—*disputing*, teaching.

v. 21. *purposed in the spirit*, resolved.

v. 24. *for Diana*, of Diana.

v. 32. *more*, greater.

v. 35. *how that*, that.—*a worshipper*, the guardian of the temple.

CH. XX. v. 4. *dele into Asia*.

v. 9. *loft*, story.

v. 11. *so*, then.

v. 21. *testifying*, preaching.

v. 30. *of*, among.

CH. XXI. v. 5. *with wives*, with their wives.

v. 15. *we took up our course and went up to Jerusalem*, we prepared ourselves for our journey to Jerusalem.

v. 20. *unto him*, to Paul.

v. 21. *the customs*, the customs of the law.

v. 22. *What is it therefore*, What then must be done?

v. 25. *concluded*, decreed.

v. 37. *to be led*, entering.

v. 40. *licence*, leave.

CH. XXII. v. 2. *kept the more silence*, were more silent.

v. 3. *I am verily a man which am a Jew*, I am a Jew.

v. 4. *this way unto the death*, the Christian religion to death.

v. 9. *heard*, understood.

v. 30. *appear*, meet.

CH. XXIII. v. 1. *Men and brethren*, Brethren.

v. 3. *shall*, will.

v. 6. *hope and resurrection*, hope of the resurrection.

v. 12. *banded together*, formed a conspiracy.

v. 27. *should have been*, was on the point of being.

v. 33. *who*, the horsemen.

CH. XXIV. v. 1. *who informed*, to inform.

v. 6. *gone about*, attempted.

v. 12. *neither raising up the people, neither in the synagogue, nor in the city*, nor raising the people either in the synagogue or in the city.

v. 27. *came into Felix' room, and Felix, willing to show the Jews a pleasure*, succeeded Felix, who, to gratify the Jews.

CH. XXV. v. 3. *and desired favor against him*, requesting.—*laying wait in the way to kill him*, formed a plan to kill him on the road.

v. 5. *which among you are able*, the best informed among you.—*wickedness*, guilt.

v. 14. *declared Paul's cause*, explained the case of Paul.

v. 25. *I have determined*, I determined.

CH. XXVI. v. 5. *most straitest*, strictest.

v. 11. *persecuted them unto strange*, forced them to fly to foreign.

v. 15. *But*, Therefore.

v. 16. *in the which I shall appear unto thee*, in which I shall instruct thee.

v. 21. *went about*, attempted.

v. 23. *the people*, this people.

v. 25. *speak forth*, speak.

v. 26. *also*, therefore.—*this thing was*, they were.

v. 31. *between*, among.

CH. XXVII. v. 7. *not suffering us*, being contrary.

v. 9. *the fast*, the season.

v. 14. *wind, called Euroclydon*. North-East wind.

v. 21. *gained*, saved.

v. 23. *the angel*, an angel.—*given thee*, granted thee the preservation of.

v. 39. *they knew not the land, but they discovered a certain*

creek with a shore, they discovered an unknown land with a creek.

v. 40. *taken up, cut.—rudder bands, helm.*

CH. XXVIII. v. 1. *they were, we had.—they knew, we learned.*¹

v. 2. *barbarous people, barbarians.*

v. 3. *there came a viper out of the heat, a viper was forced out by the heat.*

v. 4. *beast, animal.—vengeance, divine justice.*

v. 13. *set a compass, and came, sailed round.*

v. 14. *so, then.*

v. 31 *no man forbidding him, without molestation.*

NOTICE OF

*The ÆNEIS OF VIRGIL, translated by C. SYM-
MONS, D. D. of Jesus College, Oxford, 4to.*²

VIRGIL has frequently been fortunate in meeting translators of taste and spirit congenial to his own. We allude to the attempts of Pitt, Sotheby, the Abbé De Lille, and the present translator. Virgil may be placed at the head of the artificial class of poets; those who, with distinguished abilities indeed, but not of the highest order, have obtained, by means of unwearied industry and a skilful use of their talents, a place in popular estimation beside the great masters of the art. He is to be considered as the representative of the Roman age of poetry; the age of polish, minute elegancies, subdued beauty, and stately dignity. No writers, who have been habitually classed together, ever differed more in the quality of their genius (not to mention the immeasurable distance in point of magnitude) than Homer and his disciple Virgil. It has sometimes occurred to us, that the comparison may be illustrated by the difference between the shield of Achilles and that of Æneas: the one a kind of reflected universe—a living picture of nature and human life in all their

¹ On the scene of this transaction, see a learned dissertation in *Classical Journal*, No. XXXVIII.—ED.

² We perceive that a second edition in octavo has just appeared.

varieties: the other a splendid history-piece, a noble work of art, dedicated to the glory of the Roman name;¹ but, as a mere work of art, no more to be compared to its prototype than the dome of a cathedral to the great arch of heaven. Homer is a god; one who can "wield these elements;" Virgil is only the most accomplished of mortals. The poetry of the one is a mighty river, traversing a whole continent, and reflecting in its mirror all the landscapes of nature and all the habitations and employments of man; that of the other is a fair and stately stream indeed, but confined within comparatively puny banks, and regulated in its course by art, yet winding among an agreeable succession of objects, and assorting best with the works of rural peace and the scenes of love.

Tybris ea fluvium, quam longa est, nocte tumentem
 Leniit, et tacita refluens ita substitit unda,
 Mitis ut in morem stagni placidaque paludis
 Sterneret æquor aquis, remo ut luctamen abesset.
 Ergo iter inceptum celerant; rumore secundo
 Labitur uncta vadis abies: mirantur et undæ,
 1 Miratur nemus insuetum fulgentia longe
 Scuta virum, fluvio pictasque innare carinas.
 Olli remigio noctemque diemque fatigant,
 • • Et longos superant flexus, variisque teguntur
 Arboribus, viridesque secant placido æquore sylvas.

For the above hasty and crude observations we must beg pardon of the reader, and return to our proper subject, lest he should suspect us of having robbed (and murdered too) some modern lecturer on poetry, or critic. Of English translations of the *Æneid*, Dryden's and Pitt's are most in vogue. The former, like most of its author's performances in the same way, is rather a transmutation than a transfusion of the original. Denham, or some other of our older writers, gives it as his opinion, that a translator of poetry ought to extract the spirit of the original, and infuse a new one of his own; if by this it is meant that the translator should impart the peculiar coloring of

¹ Perhaps we shall be thought a little fanciful—but we cannot help considering *Æneas*, as delineated in the poem which bears his name, no bad representative of his posterity the Romans, in the representation of Livy; a brave soldier and a good general, observant of the offices of religion, and particularly tenacious of his relative duties—the Grandison of heroic times; invading the rights of others on the best possible pretexts, and conquering countries merely in self-defence. To do him justice, indeed, this is rather the impression of his character left on the mind of the reader, than the reality as intended by Virgil; in which there are some really noble points. Virgil has *defined* *Æneas* a true hero; but he wanted skill to paint him as such.

his own mind to the work translated in lieu of that by which it was before characterised, it seems a strange critical precept; yet this rule Dryden practically followed. To his *Æneid* may be applied what has been said of Kean's *Coriolanus*. It is not Virgil; but it is a good thing of a different kind. It has little or nothing of the dignity, the tenderness, the delicacy, the equable delicacy of the original; but it has a vigor, a freedom, a delightful vivacity, of which the original affords no example. It is truly and properly *Dryden's Æneid*. With all its coarsenesses, therefore, and its inequalities, as a poem it is beyond comparison superior to any of its successors; as a translation it ranks below them. Pitt exhibits far more of his author's peculiar character; but he wants fire; and in his attempts to make Virgil finer than he is, he frequently injures him. He is perpetually "gilding the refined gold." He wanted the powers of his master Pope.

Judging of Dr. Symmons's translation from our present acquaintance with it, we should perhaps say, that it has more poetry than Pitt's, and more resemblance to the original than Dryden's, but overloaded with ornament, and a little deficient in ease. In this last respect he is inferior to Pitt. Pitt's couplets follow one another in leisurely and unembarrassed pomp, like the hexameters of Claudian, or the sentences in Johnson's *Ramblers*. His weapons may be inferior, but he wields them with more facility. The defect of Dr. Symmons's performance, indeed, is a pervading air of stiffness, and (if we may so express ourselves) a want of continuity. He seems to be deficient in the connecting power—the organ of unity. One paragraph succeeds another, but is not combined with it. The different parts of his narrations and descriptions appear isolated and detached from one another. Hence a perpetual *non sequitur*—an air of *inconséquence*, which haunts the reader throughout the whole work. On the whole, however, could the performance before us be cleared of the faults with which it is encrusted, we are not certain that it would not be superior to any translation of Virgil in our language. The author displays a practised skill in the management of the couplet of Pope, and seems to understand the numerous little secrets of elegance, which constitute much of its charm. He has likewise a sincere affection for his author, and enters into the discussion of his excellencies *con amore*. But we shall content ourselves with extracting a few specimens; leaving the more extended discussion of the merits of our author to other critics.

The following is the Dr.'s version of the exordium :

- Arms, and the man who first, by Fate's command,
From Ilion flying, sought Italia's strand,
And gain'd Lavinium, are my themes of song.
Long toss'd by waves, on land he suffer'd long :
From power supernal, such his doom of woe ;
By her deep ire condemn'd as Juno's foe.
- Much too in war he bore, ere Fate assign'd
His walls to rise, or gods to be enshrined
In Latium : whence the Latin offspring came,
Old Alba's chiefs, and Rome's majestic frame.

The description of the Æolian cave is thus rendered :

- While thus she gave her boiling bosom vent,
Her course the Goddess to Æolia bent,
Parent of storms ; within whose pregnant womb
The whirlwind grows in power, and heaves for room.
The winds, his restless subjects, here with chains,
In a vast cave, king Æolus constrains.
Mad with controll, they shake their prison's bounds ;
And the high mountain with their howl resounds.
- Aloft in state their sceptred Lord presides ;
Soothes their fierce spirits, and their fury guides.
- By him uncheck'd, their lawless force would tear
Earth, seas, and skies, and scatter them in air.
Prescient of this, in caverns, deep in night,
- The Sire of Nature plunged their dangerous might :
With mountains crush'd, and gave a king to awe ;
To hold or loose them with the reins of law.

Our next extract shall be the description of the harbour in which the Trojan ships took refuge after the storm :

There, in the bosom of the land recess'd,
Screen'd by a fronting island's rocky breast,
Which breaks the surges rolling from the main,
Spreads a deep haven in a glassy plain.
Chiffs threat on either side ; and o'er them rise
Two giant summits, that invade the skies.
Mute at their feet the subject waves repose ;
And woods, sun-lighted, glitters on their brows.
Gloomy beneath, the shades collected throw
A sable horror on the flood below.
Where the barr'd waters meet the closing land,
A grot is arch'd by Nature's curious hand.
Within the fretted dome fresh fountains play ;
And seats of spar reflect a living ray ;
Hæunt of the nymphs. In this environ'd sea
The wave-worn vessels float at liberty :
Safe, though by no retaining cables bound ;
Nor held with biting anchors to the ground.

We give the following, as no unfavorable specimen of our author's narrative style :

We sail, till near us the Ceraunia rise ;
Whence o'er the narrowest main Italia lies.

And now the sun in mellowing glory fades ;
 And all the mountains solemn twilight shades.
 The watch we fix by lot ; then, landing, rest,
 Stretch'd at our ease on earth's delicious breast.
 There, as diffused we lie, sleep's genial dews
 Bathe our tired nerves, and healing power infuse.
 Night by the hours, her sable handmaids, driven,
 Had scarcely gain'd the steepy brow of heaven ;
 When from his slumbers Palinurus sprung ;
 And on the breeze with ear attentive hung ;
 Then view'd the stars that gemm'd the ethereal plain,
 The showery Hyads, and the northern wain :
 Mark'd as, unstain'd with mists, Arcturus roll'd ;
 And great Orion flamed in arms of gold.
 Then, when he saw the heavens undimm'd with cloud,
 He gave the signal from his ship aloud.
 Our camp we move, and to the sea repair ;
 Spread our wide sails, and catch the spreading air.
 Aurora's blushes purple now the skies ;
 And every star before her radiance flies :
 When, stretch'd in shady perspective, we see
 The hills and prostrate shores of Italy.
 " Italia !" first Achates' shouts proclaim :
 And all our ships resound Italia's name.

In the sixth book, that exquisite specimen of Virgilian art and power, Dr. Symmons has not been so successful. We sub-join the conversation between Æneas and Deiphobus, as illustrative of the charges which we have brought against the author's manner, and as affording a better idea of the general style of the translation, than some of the preceding extracts :

And here, Deiphobus ! he saw thy shade ;
 Whose form the havoc of the sword betray'd :
 Lopp'd of both hands ; the head of ears bereft ;
 And with dishonest wounds the nostrils cleft.
 Him as he shrunk, desirous to conceal
 The dire defacements of the mangling steel,
 Æneas hardly knew, and first address'd,
 Surprise and sorrow struggling in his breast :
 " Deiphobus ! renown'd for martial force !
 With blood derived from god-like Teucer's source !
 What heart could wish the vengeance that I see ?
 What hand had power to wreak it thus on thee ?
 Fame told me that, in Troy's disastrous night,
 O'erspent with slaughter, not overcome in fight,
 Thou tell'st upon accumulated death,
 The unconquer'd hero to thy latest breath.
 Then on Rhœtæan's shore a tomb I raised ;
 Gave it thy name, and with thine arms emblaz'd :
 And thrice my lifted voice invoked thy shade.
 Thy corse, my friend ! escaped the scorch I made ;

And wrong'd my wish, to thee and friendship just,
To place in Phrygian earth thy honour'd dust."
"All," said the mournful ghost of Priam's son,
"For my sad corse thy piety has done.
These wrongs from Fate and Helen's guilt I prove :
These the dire tokens of the Spartan's love!
Too well thou know'st in what pernicious joy
We pass'd the night that saw the wreck of Troy :
The scene with horror memory recalls ;
When big with death the horse o'erleapt our walls,
And triumph'd in our town : that fateful night,
Pretending orgies and the festive rite,
Girt with our female Bacchanals, she raised
In her fell hand the signal flame, that blazed
To point the Grecians to their destined prey.
Spent with the toils and pleasures of the day,
In the disastrous room my couch I press'd,
With senses whelm'd in sweet and death-deep rest.
The egregious wife meanwhile disarm'd her lord ;
And robb'd my pillow of my trusty sword.
Then, fondly deeming with my blood, thus spilt,
To blot the record of her former guilt,
And make a great peace-offering of my fate,
She to her Grecian spouse unlock'd my gate.
Why should I more the dreadful tale prolong?
With curst Ulysses in the assassin throng,
They burst my chamber, and my sleep invade.
O ! be the murderous deed on Greece repaid !
If justly, O ye Gods ! my voice demands
This debt of vengeance from your righteous hands.
But thou, in turn, declare what wondrous cause
To these sad realms thy daring footstep draws.
Comest thou a wanderer by fierce Ocean driven ?
Compell'd by Fortune, or the will of Heaven ?
That thus in depths, where sun-beams never dive,
Thou roam'st Death's pallid universe alive."

Dr. Symonds has thrown too much of an English coloring over his original. We have also to complain of a few Johnsonian or Darwinian Latinisms, such as,

My wretched food has been the herbaceous field. iii. 818.

The sire dismiss'd them through the churning gate. vi. 1199.

Such lines as the following are too plain-spoken for Virgil :

But ah ! without the Gods 'tis vain to hope success. ii. 534.

These things befall us by the Gods' high will. ib. 1042.

The translation of "*pollutum hospitium*," (*Æn.* iii. 61.) is faulty in a contrary way :

the shore

Where Hospitality had died in gore. l. 80.

So also in the fifth book :

placida laxant membra quiete

Sub remis fusi per dura sedilia nautæ. l. 836.

In placid rest the seamen's wearied ranks
Found toil could soften beds of naked planks. l. 1060.

We may remark that in his description of Polyphemus, in the third *Æneid*, our author has unwarily crossed the path of a modern satirical poet :

Lanigeræ comitantur oves : ea sola voluptas,
Solamenque mali. l. 660.

This Dr. Symmons, imitating the alliteration of his original, renders :

His fleecy vassals wait upon their lord ;
These the sole solace that his ills afford. l. 862.

This reminds us of Kotzebue's " reformed housekeeper," who, as described in the poetry of the Antijacobin,

Bids brandied cherries, by infusion slow,
Imbibe new flavour, and their own forego,
Sole cordial of her heart, sole solace of her woe !¹

ON THE INTERPRETATION OF ARISTOTLE'S FAMOUS DEFINITION OF TRAGEDY.

[Extracted from *Epist. Crit. Barkeri ad Boissonad.* appended to an Edition of *Arcadius*, just published at Leipsic.]

Vox κάθαρσις aliquando usurpatur pro purgatione i. e. cultura animi per philosophiam, quæ, ut a veteribus philosophis definitum est, (vide Senecam Ep. 89.) nihil aliud est quam rerum divinarum et humanarum, quibus hæ res continentur, scientia.

Eunapius in *Vita Maximi* p. 86. ed. 1568. : Σὺ δὲ τούτων μηδὲν θαυμάσης, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ ἐγὼ, διὰ τοῦ λόγου κάθαρσιν, μέγα τι χρεῖμα ὑπολαμβάνω, propterea quod ratio nos rectius imbuerit.

Plut. in *Libro, An Seni Resp. gerenda sit*, c. 8. : Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡ τοῦ φρονεῖν ἕξις ὁμοίως παραμένει τοῖς μεθεῖσιν αὐτοὺς, ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἀργίας ἐξανισμένη καὶ ἀναλυσμένη κατὰ μικρὸν, αἰεὶ τινα ποθεῖ φροντίδος μελέτην, τὸ λογιστικὸν ἐξειρούσης καὶ διακαθαίρουσης.

λάμπει γὰρ ἐν χρείαισιν ὥσπερ εὐπρεπὴς χαλκός.

¹ Southey (*Thalaba xi.*) has " Friend and sole solace of my solitude."

Sic vox ἀνακάθαρσις exponitur a Maximo in Scholiis p. 48. allegorici et reconditi sensus anagogica explanatio : Ἀνακαθάρσεις φησὶ τὰς ἐξηγητικὰς ἐρμηνείας, δι' ὧν καθαίρονται τῶν ἐν τοῖς λεγομένοις δοκούντων ἀτόπων τὰ σύμβολα. Conf. Budæum Comment. Gr. L., H. Steph. Thes., et Suicerum Thes. Eccles.

Ut apud Lat. Scriptores philosophia est duplex, physica, quæ "studeat omnium rerum divinarum atque humanarum vim, naturam, causasque nosse" (Cic. de Orat. I. 49.), et ethica, "animi medicina" (Cic. Tusc. 3, 6. c. 3.), "quæ vitia radicitus extrahit" (Tusc. 2, 13. c. 5.), "ars vitæ" (De Fin. 3, 4. c. 2.), "magistra virtutis" (Tusc. 4, 70.), "mater omnium benefactorum beneque dictorum" (de Clar. Orat. II. 322.), sic κάθαρσις ap. Græcos scriptores, quæ nihil aliud est, ut diximus, quam animi cultura per philosophiam, aliquando, ut in Eunapii loco, reserenda est ad physicam sapientiam, quæ rerum naturam perscrutatur, aliquando autem ad ethicam, quæ animum componit, afficitus quasi purgans, imminuens, leniens, temperans, "ita ut ad μεσότητα quandam, i. e. mediocritatem, restringantur : in mediocritate enim ista virtutem positam esse, 'perturbationibusque adhibendum modum quandam, quem ultra progredi non oporteat,' ut loquitur Cic. Tusc. IV. 17., docebat Aristoteles, Ethic. Nicom. II. 5. p. 27. e." Matthiæ Miscell. philblog. Vol. II. P. I. pap. 23. In hoc postremo sensu vox κάθαρσις usurpatur ap. Aristotelem Poët. c. 6. :

Ἔστιν οὖν τραγωδία μίμησις πράξεως σπουδαίας καὶ τελείας, μέγεθος ἐχούσης, ἡδυσμένην λόγῳ, χωρὶς ἐκάστῳ (sic Tyrwh. pro ἐκάστου) τῶν εἰδῶν ἐν τοῖς μορίοις, δρώντων καὶ οὐ δι' ἀπαγγελίας, ἀλλὰ δι' ἐλέου καὶ φόβου, περαίνουσα τὴν τῶν τοιούτων παθημάτων κάθαρσιν.

Ad hunc insignem Aristotelis locum dubio procul respexit Jamblichus de Myst. sect. I. cap. 11. p. 22. :

Ἐχει δ' ἔτι ταῦτα καὶ ἄλλον λόγον τοιοῦτον· αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων παθημάτων ἐν ἡμῖν, πάντα μὲν εἰργόμεναι, καθίστανται σφοδρότεραι· εἰς ἐνέργειαν δὲ, βραχεῖς καὶ ἄχρι τοῦ συμμέτρου προαγόμεναι, χαίρουσι μετρίως, καὶ ἀποπληροῦνται, καὶ ἐντεῦθεν ἀποκαθαίρονται, πειθοὶ καὶ οὐ πρὸς βίαν ἀποαύονται· διὰ τοῦτο ἐν τῇ κωμῳδίᾳ καὶ τραγωδίᾳ ἀλλότρια πάθη θεωροῦντες, ἴσταμεν τὰ οἰκεία πάθη, καὶ μετριώτερα ἀπεργαζόμεθα, καὶ ἀποκαθαίρομεν ἐν τε τοῖς ἱεροῖς, θεάμασί τισι καὶ ἀκούσματι τῶν αἰσχυρῶν, ἀπολυόμεθα τῆς ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων ἀπ' αὐτῶν συμμιπούσης βλάβης.

Nec Tyrwhittus, nec Twiningius, nec Lessingius, nec Hermannus, nec Matthiæ (Miscell. philolog. Vol. II. P. I. p. 19—27., ubi optime disputavit de Aristotelis loco) hæc Jamblichi

verba adduxit ad obscurissimam illam Aristotelis sententiam, quam luce clariorem faciunt, illustrandam. Bene Galeus ad Jamblichum scripsit:

“Aristoteles de Poët. I. 3. ait Tragœdiam δι' ἐλέου καὶ φόβου τὴν τῶν τοιούτων παθημάτων κάθαρσιν præstare. Meminit hujus καθάρσεως in Polit. IX. 7. et de ea ex professo egerat in tertio de Poëtice libro, qui periit. Sciendum autem Aristotelem et Jamblichum in his Platoni adversari, qui ideo Comœdias et Tragœdias rejecit, quia nimium incenderent in nobis τὸ παθητικόν, et nimium a simplicitate et morum stabilitate abducerent διὰ τὴν ποικιλίαν. Platoni favebat Epicurus. Proclus in Polit. p. 360. pugnam hanc inter Philosophorum principes animadvertit, et multis adversus Peripateticos velitur. Tantæ litis idoneus judex audiatur Plut. de Audiendis Poëtis. Habet nonnihil, quod huc spectet, Aristides quoque Quintilianus de Musica L. II., et Julianus, Ἱερωμένος τις μήτε Ἀρχιλόχον ἀναγινωσκέτω, etc. Ἀποκλινέτω καὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς κωμῳδίας ὅσα τῆς ἰδέας τοιαύτης. De purgatione agit Plotinus Enead. I. 2. 5.”

“Sequitur tertia via, quæ est philosophi. Huc pertinent quæ Platonice rationis sectatores de gradibus tradunt, quibus anima paullatim pura divinaque redditur. Scilicet ii ita distinguunt, ut inchoari illam perfectionem dicant καθάρσει, tanquam primo instituto. Ei succedere, tradunt, λύσιν sive ἀπαλλαγὴν, et cumulum denique addi per τελείωσιν (Jamblich. de Myst. Ægypt. V. 6. ibique Galeus p. 264.).” Fr. Creuzerus ad Plotini Librum de Pulcritudine p. CVI. (Heidelbergæ 1814. 8.) Iterum p. CXI.:—“Versatur hic idem liber magnam partem in admonitionibus præceptionibusque ad fugam earum rerum, quæ sensus feriunt, inprimis quæ vel sonorum dulcedine eos tiullant, vel iisdem blandiuntur venustate mollitieque formarum. Est igitur hactenus mere purgatorius (καθάρσις) hicce liber, panditque aditum ad philosophiam, ut quæ et ipsa quodammodo pertineat ad κάθαρσιν, sed nec minus tamen λύσιν perficiat atque adeo τελείωσιν.” Iterum pag. 277. “De καθάρσει vid. Jambl. in libro de Anima ap. Stob. Ecl. p. 1056. seq. Heer.: Πλωτῖνος δὲ καὶ οἱ πλείστοι τῶν Πλατωνικῶν ἀπόθεσιν τῶν παθῶν—τὴν τελειωτάτην κάθαρσιν ὑπολαμβάνουσιν. Gregor. Naz. Orat. stel. I. adv. Julian. p. 37. sq. Etenim describit sanctioris vitæ studiosos homines: Ὁρᾶς—τοὺς διὰ τὴν νέκρωσιν ἀθανάτους; τοὺς διὰ λύσιν Θεῶ συννημμένους; τοὺς ἔξω πόθου, καὶ μετὰ τοῦ θείου καὶ ἀπαθoῦς ἔρωτος; ὦν—καὶ ἡ τοῦ νοῦ πρὸς Θεὸν ἐκδημία προαρχαζομένου, ὦν ἡ κάθαρσις, καὶ ὦν τὸ καθαίρεσθαι, μηδὲν μέτρον εἰδόντων ἀναβάσεως καὶ θεώσεως.”

Iterum p. 239. :—" Jamblichus de Myster. Æg. X. 7. p. 178. : *Αὐτὸ τὰγαθὸν, τὸ μὲν θεῖον ἡγοῦνται τὸν προενοούμενον θεόν· τὸ δ' ἀνθρώπινον, τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἕνασιν*—οὐδ' *περὶ σμικρῶν οἱ θεουργοὶ τὸν θεῖον νοῦν ἐνοχλοῦσιν· ἀλλὰ περὶ τῶν εἰς ψυχῆς κάθαρσιν καὶ ἀπόλυσιν καὶ σωτηρίαν ἀνηκόντων.* Extrema haud inepte conferas verbis Paulinus 1 Cor. I. 30, ubi *ἀγιασμὸν* Grammatici explicant *κάθαρσιν.*"

Platonicae philosophiæ sectatores hanc notionem de purgatione animæ ipsiusque in mentem conversione e Platone ipso sumserunt : in Phædone p. 186. ed. Forster. (p. 21. Wytt. p. 69. Heind.) legas hæc, quæ Plotinus de Pulcritudine p. 55. p. 40. a., notante Creuzero, respexit : *Τὸ δ' ἀληθές, τῷ ὄντι ἡ κάθαρσις τις τῶν τοιούτων πάντων, καὶ ἡ σωφροσύνη, καὶ ἡ δικαιοσύνη, καὶ ἡ ἀνδρεία· καὶ κινδυνεύωσι καὶ οἱ τὰς τελευτὰς ἡμῖν οὗτοι καταστήσαντες οὐ φαῦλοί τινες εἶναι, ἀλλὰ τῷ ὄντι πάλαι αἰνίττεσθαι, ὅτι ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἀτέλεστος εἰς ἄδου ἀφίκεται, ἐν βορβόρῳ κείσεται, ὃ ἐκ παραχρᾶτος τε καὶ τετελεσμένος, ἐκείσε ἀφικόμενος, μετὰ θεῶν οἰκήσει.*

OXFORD PRIZE POEM FOR 1806.

TRAFALGAR.

EST locus e lava nautæ tendentis ad Austros
 Hesperiumque salum, cum jam Vincentia saxa
 Consciaque Angliacæ decedunt littora famæ;
 Necdum etiam Herculeæ fauces, sejunctaque regnis
 Ipsa suis aperit jugum inexpugnabile Calpe—
 Nempe obscura diu Rupes, parsique Trafalgar
 Nominis, hinc nostris jam tandem insignior armis;
 Hinc, cheu! memoranda nimis!—tibi pectore tristi
 Rite triumphales cantus, feraliaque inter
 Munera, funestæ aggredior præconia laudis.
 Quippe ubi jamdudum Britonum nota arma pavescens
 Gallus, et indigno sociatus foedere Iberus

Oceanum occiduum, atque arva intemerata Bahamæ
 Deseruit, partaque (nefas !) sine vulnere præda
 Fata fuga evasit, nimiumque faventibus auris,
 Continuo in portum sese, segnesque latebras
 Abdit, et e tutis prospectat Gadibus hostem—
 Ignava interea dudum statione moratum
 Impulerit seu lenta fames, sive addita fallax
 Spes numeris, sociæque auimet fiducia classis,
 Stat pelagus tentare, atque arma infausta Britannis
 Conserere, et dubiæ tandem se credere pugna—
 Demens ! qui Nostros toties expertus ovantes,
 Ultro se inferre et trepidas opponere vires
 Ausus, et assuetos hosti instaurare triumphos.

Jam matutino scopulique et marmora ponti
 Sole rubescebant, cælum sine nubibus æther
 Pandere luce nova, et sopito murmure fluctus
 Componi—placidæ per cærula Tethyos arva
 Angliacas tacita se majestate moventes
 Cernere erat puppes—puro vexilla sereno
 Vix fluitant, lenique tumescit carbasus aura :
 Ut vero hæc inter subito data signa monebant
 Vi conjurata deductas æquore classes
 Prospici, et instructas lunato ex ordine proras,
 —O ! quanta Angliaci pertentant pectora nautæ
 Gaudia !—continuo ante oculos hortantis imago
 Stat Patriæ—sacer ille animos accendit, ut olim,
 Ignis, et instigat laudum insatiata cupido.

Nec mora—quin medio ne aggressos impete fallat
 Hostis, et incautos curvata classe Britannos
 Sepiat, instruitur geminus recto agmine contra
 Ordo ratum—sequitur paribus, sortita laborem
 Quæque suum, spatiis, obliquoque ardua sulco
 Findit aquas, mediumque instat perrumpere cornu—
 Circum cuncta silent—mortique simillimus horror
 Puppibus incumbit, neque enim prius ingruit undis
 Belli ingens tonitru, quam obnixa carina carinæ,
 Atque latus lateri ; quam transtra minantia transtris
 Vincula dura tenent, ferratusque alligat uncus—
 O ! ubi jam pelagus placidum, sudique diei
 Purpureum jubar ?—extemplo caligine cælum
 Obvolvi picea, et denso certamine junctas
 Inter se puppes fumo circum ignea nubes
 Obruit, et late feralibus incubat umbris.

At Sol decedens frustra obluctata *Britannis*
Agmina, nec dubio suspensum examine *Martem*
 Prospicit—exhausto ut sensim venit ignis ab hoste
 Pallidior ; sensim jam decrescente tumultu
 Apparet strages, rerumque miserrima *fiactarum*
Indicia, et laceris submissa *aplustria velis* . .
 Rarior erumpens adversa e classe per undas
 Auditur fragor, et mœstis sonat intervallis
Læsorum planctus, creberve extrema gementum
 Spiritus, aut in aquas jactum de puppe cadaver.

At vero interea solitus nonne æthera *Pæan*
 Perstrepat, assuetoque sonat *Victoria* plausu ?—
 Eheu ! funereæ ninium vicina cupresso
Laurus, et ingenti parta eheu ! *Gloria* luctu !
 Non hæc discedens dederat promissa *Britannis*
 Ille suis—neque enim imposita est tam dura triumpho
Lex ea *Niliaco*—non merces illa subactæ
Ulsinora—proh ! lapsa salus atque invida *Fata* !
 Omne quem fausto reducem gratarier olim
 Sperabat *Patria*, et titulis decorare superbis,
Fortunæ secunda nimis ! nunc corpus inane
 Expectat mœsta, ut saltem (solatia luctus
Tenuia !) supremos umbræ persolvat honores.

Scilicet ille dies memori nunquam excidet ævo
 Quo tristes inter gemitus, concussaue luctu
 Pectora, funeream ducens longo ordine pompam
 Mandabat cineres *Patriæ* pia cura sepulchro :
 Ibat mœsta phalanx, versisque exercitus armis—
 Ibant pullati proceres, lacrymisque *Juventus*
Regia suffusis, tantæ ne debitus umbræ
 Desit honos, tristi fletu comitata feretrum—
 Post, quibus albuerant jam longo tempora *Marte*
Fraterno desiderio solvuntur, inertes
 Multa sibi dexteras quæsti, tardamque senectam,
 Qued non pro patria media inter fulmina belli
 Contigit oppetere, atque hunc ignorasse dolorem—
 At fidi ante alios socii, (queis gloria tanto
 Sub duce militiam gessisse, tuumque *Trafalgar*
 Una ingens peperisse decus,) lento pede mœsti
 Procedunt ; furtim generoso e pectore rumpit
 Eluctans gemitus, suspiriaque intus ab imo
 Corde tument, grandesque micant in lumine guttæ.

At verò irrepāt ne quando in tarda vēternus
 Sæcula, nec resides moveant ingentia belli
 Pæcta animos, solido ponet de marmore signum
 Anglia, et ingenti suffultam mole columnam;
 Aut veteres inter socios, ubi flexibus errans
 Caruleis sanctas Thæmæsis præterfluit ædes,
 Hospitia emeriti nautæ, fractæque senectæ;
 Sive ubi candentes attollit maxima cautes
 Dubris, et Armoricos portus et mille garinas
 Despectat secura, et inertem provocat hostem.

Interea egregia consurgens arte Columna
 Quadratam faciem, sculptisque horrentia pugnis
 Attollat latera, et partes se pandat in omnes.

Principio, Eoos qua frons obvertitur Euros,
 Fingat aquas opifex refluentiaque ostia Nili,
 Et duplicem belli speciem, confusaque passim
 Signa, et nocturnis late freta pallida flammis.

Parte alia, gelidam facies qua prospicit Arcton,
 Elsinoram, et fusos proprio sub littore Cimbros,
 Atque catenatas cælet fracto ordine puppes:
 Quinetiam in mediis, magnaue astante corona,
 Ipse heros, crines felici comitus oliva,
 Jura dabit populis et honestæ fœdera pacis.

Addat et illæsa florentes messe Bahamas,
 Fidentemque fuga Gallum, dum classe Britannus
 Instat ovans: illum aspiceres freta tarda remensi
 Culpæ Oceani, segnesque in carbasa ventos
 Poscere, et inmissis raptim dare funibus Austros.

Contra autem surgent longe spectanda, Trafalgar,
 Saxa tua, ingentes surgent imitata triumphos
 Marmora, non æquo tot rapta ex hoste tropæa,
 Bisque decem nostro submissa aplustria nautæ.
 Ipsum inter belli strepitus heros juvabit
 Mirari; nec jam votivo vulneré morti
 Ulro occumbentem (quippe hæc æterna Britannis
 Tristitiæ monumenta forent!) sed qualis inibat
 Prælia, et in medio, placidus ceu pace, tumultu
 "MUNERE QUEMQUE SUO FUNGI," (fausta omnia!)
 nautis

Pectore composito mandans, vultusque sereni
 Lumine, felicitatis referens præsagia Martis.

At tu, seu nautis errantibus utilis olim
 Meta per hybernos fluctus, seu claustra propinquis
 Certa dabas populis, ignoto in littore rupes

Hactenus obscura, at seris nunc addita Musis
 Gloria, jam demum nostris præclarior armis,
 Inter Atlantæos surgis memoranda triumphos :
 Ergo ubi cæruleas albescere visa per undas
 Nota patet cautes, secum alta in mente volutat
 Navita, dum obtutu pendet delixus in uno,
 Virtutes, sortenique Viri, visuque solutus
 In lacrymas te sancta Anima haud oblita tuorum
 Voce vocat, surdæque preces immurmurat umbræ—
 Continuo ante oculos astare Herois Imago,
 Inspiratque animis et amorem laudis, et ignes
 Insolitos, et quicquid id est, quo rapta dici
 Ætherios inter tractus, et luminis oras
 Sese Anima evectam præter terrestria sentit.

Recitavit in Theatro JOHANNES LATHAM,

1806.

Coll. Æm. Nas. COMMENSALIS.

Cursory Observations on a translation of the Arabic Manuscript describing the death of MUNGO PARK, by Mr. ABRAHAM SALAMÉ, inserted in an account of a mission to Ashantee, by T. E. BOWDICH, Esq. p. 478.; occasioned by reflections made in the Quarterly Review, No. XLIV. p. 294., on another translation of the same manuscript by JAMES GREY JACKSON.

HAVING observed in the last Number of the Quarterly Review, under the title of Bowdich's Mission to Ashantee, p. 294, an opinion that a preference is due to Mr. Abraham Salamé's translation of the Arabic manuscript of the death of the lamented Mungo Park, I consider it as an act of justice to myself and the public, to offer a few cursory observations on that loose, defective, and unintelligible translation. It is expedient that I should previously inform the intelligent reader, that I gave Mr. Bowdich a *decypher* and a translation of the Arabic document inserted in his work on Ashantee, purporting to be a manuscript or certificate of the death of the indefatigable and enterprising Mungo Park. When I received this document from Mr. Bowdich's hands, to decypher and to translate, I understood clearly and unequivocally from that gentleman,

that he had been endeavouring, ever since his arrival in England from Ashantee, to procure a correct *decypher* and translation of it, but that he had not succeeded.—I felt myself competent to the task; and I thought that, if I did not supply him with a translation, he would possibly be obliged to publish his book without one, or at least without a *decypher*. I knew from previous experience during the last ten years, that whenever His Majesty's government or the Admiralty had been in want of translations of Arabic documents, they were obliged to apply, and had actually applied to me for the same: incontestable evidence of which facts I have in my possession. I knew that the intelligent part of my countrymen were extremely anxious to know the fate of the lamented Mungo Park; this alone was a sufficient stimulus for me to engage to decypher and translate this manuscript document gratuitously; but what has been my reward for my disinterested exertions? Not thanks, but abuse from the Quarterly Reviewers, who have affected to prefer Mr. Salamé's translation to mine, although I believe none but those critics can comprehend that gentleman's unintelligible translation of this document. For a proof of this I refer the candid reader to the Quarterly Review itself, in which both translations are laid before the public. Nothing has preserved this document from oblivion, but the circumstance of its containing intelligence of Mr. Park; but as I have given to the public a translation of this paper which has produced controversy, and as I am now to state my observations on Mr. Salamé's translation of this document, I wish it to be understood that I mean nothing personal: it is the unavoidable weakness of human nature to err; but my object is to elicit truth. I shall therefore proceed to investigate, not the errors or the talents of that translator, but the inaccuracy of his translation.

The Quarterly Reviewer seems to have forgot that it is necessary to understand practically as well as theoretically two languages, to be enabled accurately to translate any language; and he is incorrect in supposing that Mr. Salamé's translation is the best because it is his native language. This is not a necessary consequence, for many people do not understand their own native language, innumerable examples of which might be adduced without going out of England.

Some of the public papers¹ have asserted, that Mr. Salamé's translation and mine differ but immaterially; but no man who understands Arabic, I presume, will be of this opinion, after comparing the following passage.

هذه الوثيقة خرج من بلد حوسا يقال بور

¹ See the Englishman, 9th May, 1819, title, 'Mungo Park'; also the British Statesman, and other papers about the same day.

"This declaration is issued from the town called Yaud, in the country of Kossa." Vide Mr. Salamé's translation.

"This narrative proceeds from the territory in Housa called Eearee or Yaury."² Vide Mr. Jackson's translation.

The reader's attention is referred to the respective translations above, and I maintain, and I anticipate that every erudite Arabian scholar will support my assertion, that the words *town*, *Yaud*, and *Kossa* are not to be found in the original Arabic:

1 انما نحن جلسنا 2 نسمع صاخ صبيان 3 لرايت السفينة

Anma n'henna gilsen^a, ensemmahu sakh sebian, arreet sfeena.
And as we were sitting, we heard the voice of children. I saw a ship; that is to say, I the sheerif saw a ship. This is a literal translation from the original; first نحن which is the plural pronoun personal *we*, and afterwards لرايت which is the singular preterite of the verb راي to see.

Mr. Salamé in his translation has omitted the sentence

2 نسمع صاخ صبيان n'smahu sakh sebian
i. e. we heard the voice of children; which he has rendered, We sat to hear the voice of some persons: but there is no authority for *some persons* in the original.

4 فا رسل سلطان fa rassul Sultan, and the Sultan sent.
The preterite of the verb Mr. Salamé has rendered pluperfect, for he writes "*had sent plenty*;" but the Arabic scholar will perceive that there is no authority, in the original, for the pluperfect time; if it had been the pluperfect, it would necessarily have been
فا كان رسل سلطان Fa kan rassul Sultan.

5 و عقدان في السفينة wa akkadan fie sfeena;
i. e. there were persons bound³ or fastened in the vessel. The word akkadan is the preterite of the verb عقد, akkad, to bind.

Mr. Bowdich, in giving the note on this passage, has omitted to

² It should be observed, in converting Arabic names into English letters, that the English double c, the Greek i, or English y, are synonymous letters; the final ce or y in Eearee is optional, the last letter of the word being r, which is governed by Kasra.

³ These two men bound with cords or otherwise, might have appeared like dead men to Amadou Fatouma, who reported to Isaaco respecting Park's death. (See Park's Travels reviewed in Quarterly Review, No. xxv.) Being bound, they probably could not move, and would therefore resemble dead men. The circumstance of missile weapons, as lances, pikes, and arrows, being discharged at Mr. Park by the natives, as reported by Isaaco, is corroborated in my translation of this document of the sheerif Ibrahim, and which is actually in the original و كوب في سفينة wa kûb^a fie sfcena; but this important passage is totally

relate the circumstance that led to its interpretation, which he knows to be the fact, and is as follows. At the time I gave him my translation, Sir William Ouseley wrote from Wales, to say, that this sentence signified two female slaves. Mr. Salamé, who was then in London, said the same; but how two Arabic professors, at a distance of upwards of 100 miles, should both be of this same opinion, excited my curiosity. I went with Mr. Bowdich to Mr. Bulmer, the printer, and I asked Mr. Turner, the Arabic compositor, if he could account for the coincidence? Mr. Turner replied, "O yes, they have both the authority of Richardson." Richardson's Arabic Dictionary was produced, and it there appears that عقدان in a *figurative sense* means virgins. Both these gentlemen then, it seems, had had recourse to the Dictionary for this figurative interpretation; but I could not admit the propriety of interpreting words in a figurative sense, which were found in a document, which, so far from having the flowers of rhetoric to recommend it, was not written with even grammatical accuracy. The verb عقد, to bind or fasten, is generally used in the west of Africa, in a plain, literal sense, a circumstance which I conceive to be an incontrovertible argument for not using it in its figurative meaning.

و يدعوه سلطان 6 wa edäülume Sultan.

These words literally signify, 'and the Sultan summoned them,' or 'argued them strongly,' or 'called aloud to them;' not simply 'asked them,' as Mr. Salamé has translated it: the verb *ask* is not in the original.

Mr. Salamé's translation runs thus: "while they were sitting in the ship and gaining a position over the Cape Kood, and were in society with the people of the king of Bassa, the ship reached a head of mountain which took her away, and the men and women of Bassa altogether with every kind of arms." From this phraseology it would appear that the ship *contained* the men and women of Bassa all armed, before the current carried her away; but there is no authority for such an interpretation: the original says

7 و كوب في السفينة wa kubu fie sfecna;

i. e. they poured into the ship, that is, poured 'their missile weapons, and fired their guns into the ship.

Further on, the original has the following passage;

8 و رمي ماله كله في البحر wa ermy melha kulha fie elb'har

omitted in Mr. Salamé's translation, for which see Quarterly Review, No. XLIV. p. 294.

¹ See a confirmation of this interpretation in a letter from the late Sir Joseph Banks to Mr. Dickson, Mungo Park's brother, inserted in Shabeeny's account of Tombuctoo and Heusa, &c. p. 425.

that is to say, and threw the whole of *her* property or treasure into the sea, *that is, the women's property*. Mr. Salamé translates this passage, "threw all *his* property;" there is, however, no authority for transferring the feminine into the masculine gender, as the passage itself above quoted proves, without the necessity of further elucidation.

9 الخوف ثم يأخذوا elkhûf thima eekudu; Fear there seizing him.

Here we have the masculine singular again: this loose phraseology clearly evinces the writer to have been illiterate; these words have been rendered by Mr. Salamé "*also from fear*;" but what Arabic professor in Europe will make it *also from fear*?

10 واحد منهم لم نره اقل في قهر الماء و الله اعلم صبح
wa wahud minhume lii nurrâh akul fie kaher elma, wa Allah
alem schâ.

This passage literally means, "and one of them we saw not at all in the body of the water, and God knows the truth" (of this report); but Mr. Salamé translates it, "*perhaps* he is in the *bottom* of the water, and God knows *best*." There is however no authority for the word *bottom*, nor for the word *perhaps*, nor for the word *best*, here inserted by him. Allah alem sch signifies, 'God knows the truth;' there is no *comparative* in the sentence, but it is the *positive*.

There is not any authority in the original for the word *authentic*. No Arabic scholar in Europe will find *authentic* in the manuscript: the sentence is a simple one, *Allah alem sch*, 'God knows the truth;' that is to say, the truth of this report.

It would be illiberal to ascribe to Mr. Bowdich any design to confuse. I believe the direct contrary; but if he had accompanied my letter with my translation, the one would have elucidated the other; instead of which he has blended Sir W. Ouseley's notes with my translation; thus he says in a note of Sir William, "and the other did not, from the violence of the water." See his account of a Mission to Ashantee, note p. 480: thus rendering what was clear and intelligible, obscure and ambiguous! Did not *what*? I ask; for the note does not say what. The original however is sufficiently perspicuous: it is, واحد منهما لم نره اقل في قهر الماء
wa wahud minhume lii nurrut akul fie kaher elma; which signifies literally, "and one of them we saw not at all in the body" (not the bottom) "of the water." There is no authority for the words, 'the other did not,' nor for the words, 'violence of the water;' no erudite Arabian, by the most refined sophistry, can transfer this passage into such language.

11 في دم شريف ابراهيم fie fume sheerif Ibrahim.

Kasra governs *invariably* the first Alif in the word 'Abraham, which makes it Ibrahim; this is the uniform Arabic pronunciation.

I ought to observe to the European reader, that this document purports to have been written by a sheerif, that is to say, a man descended from royal blood; but it does not thence follow that it is a correct writing: many princes in Africa can neither read nor write; I myself know two or three. Neither is the reader to affix that honor and deference to a prince of Africa, that is due to a prince of Europe; the nobility of family in Africa is not so great, because all the descendants of princes, sons, brothers, cousins, and all degrees of consanguinity, assume the title of sheerif, however distantly removed by succeeding generations, so that in Barbary there are, in proportion to the population, more sheerifs than there are nobles in Europe.

There is a sort of corroboration of *my translation* of this paper in the report that the sheerif Ibrahim made to Mr. Hutchison; for he himself told him *he had seen the ship* (see Quarterly Review, No. XLIV. p. 294.) When we compare the Arabic language and other languages of the East to those of Europe, the heterogeneous nature of their respective idioms must be evident; hence the difficulty of adapting the Eastern expressions to those of Europe: some allowances should therefore be made; for the language of the Arab, as well as the body of the Arab, becomes equally stiff and awkward in the European costume.

* I could say more on the subject of this document, but I think I have already said enough to satisfy an impartial and discriminating public respecting my translation, and to refute the erroneous opinion propagated by the Quarterly Review, that my translation of the manuscript of Park's death is not so accurate as that of Mr. Salamé.

JAMES G. JACKSON.

Note. For the gratification of such Arabians as shall be curious to investigate this subject, I have subjoined my decypher of the Manuscript, together with a copy of my letter to Mr. Bowdich, which accompanied that decypher and translation.

An accurate transcript of the Arabic manuscript of the death of Mungo Park, deciphered for Mr. Bowdich by J. G. Jackson, and inserted in that gentleman's account of a mission to Ashantee, p. 480.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
هذه الوثيقة خرج من بلد حوسا يقال

¹ A confirmation of this fact will be seen throughout the Turkish Spy, and particularly in Vol. iv. book 4th. letter 2nd.

يُور و نحن راينا الامر لم نرِي و لانسمع
 في البحر البدي يقال كوض¹ انها نحن
 جلسنا² نسمع صاخ صبيان³ لرايت السفينه
 لم نرِي مثله قط⁴ فا رسل سلطان يور
 لرايته مع البقر و الكبش مع انواع الطعام
 كثيرها رجلا و امرا وحدة والعبدان⁵ و
 عقدا في السفينة رجلا ببيضان خرجوا
 من نسب نصري⁶ و يدعوه سلطان يور
 الي ان خرجوا اليه و ابوا خروج و مشوا
 الي بلد بسا و هوا كبر من سلطان يور و
 هم يجلسون و يعلكون ملوك علي راس
 كوض و يصاخور اهل سلطان بسا لرايته
 و هم⁷ و كوب في السفينة بلغ الغينه راس
 جبل و ياخذ الجبل السفينة رجال بسا
 و النساء بسا يجمعون كلهم مع افوع السلاح
 و السفينة لم يجد طريق المنع الجبل و
 رجل الدي في السفينة قتل امراته⁸ و رمي
 ماله كله في البحر و رموا نفسها في
 البحر⁹ الخوف ثم ياخذوا بلغ خبر الي
 سلطان و اوي حتي بلغ ماه به الي بلد

كنجي بلد سلطان وأوي ودفنه في ترابه
 10 وواحد منها لم نرة لقل في قهر الماه
 والله اعلم صح 11 في قم شريف ابراهيم *
 تبت *

Letter from Mr. Jackson to Mr. Bowdich, respecting the above Arabic document.

London, 7th March, 1819.

DEAR SIR, I have deciphered the Arabic manuscript of Mungo Park's death, and I have affixed the Oriental punctuation to the letters, that Mr. Bulmer may have no difficulty in fixing the characters for the press.

This manuscript is very inaccurately and ungrammatically written, and I have preserved or transcribed the inaccuracy ^{في} the original.

I am of opinion that Sir W. Ouseley understands the Arabic of Africa, and from his observations on this manuscript, I have no doubt that he would have been able to translate the Emperor of Morocco's letter, inserted in my account of Morocco, which remained in the Secretary of State's office some months, without their finding a person capable of translating it, although it had been sent to the Universities, and to the Post Office, for that purpose, but ineffectually. I mention this circumstance, that you may know where to apply, on any future occasion, in the event of my decease or absence from England after your next embassy to Ashantee.

Sir William in the fifth line of his notes, has, however, committed an error in calling كوض Kude, Kumen. The original cannot be converted into Kumen. In the eighth note he writes: نصري i. e. nasi, that is to say, belonging to Christians; but the manuscript has نصري nas'ra or Christians: nominative plural. The word يصاكور is not a proper name, as Sir William suggests it may be, nor is it equivocally written; it signifies called out or cried to them. Sixteenth note, بلد كنجي is unequivocally Kanjee, and will not admit of

being called Kanja. Eighteenth note, Sir W. quotes the manuscript و دفنه في ترابه wa deffenha fie trabha; which cannot admit of any translation but the following, And we buried it in its earth; but Sir William translates it, And caused him or it to be buried in the ground.

As to the translation *و عقدان في السفينة* wa akaddan fie Sfeena, i. e. And tied or bound them in the vessel or ship, how this has been converted into two maids in the ship, I am at a loss to imagine.

I am, &c.

J. G. J.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

List of the principal Books of the Duke of Marlborough's Collection at White Knights, sold by Mr. Evans, Pall Mall, in June, 1819. With prices and purchasers.

PART II. [Continued from No. XLI. p. 80.]

ELEVENTH DAY'S SALE.

Octavo et Infra.

Horatii Carmina, first Aldine edition, in red morocco, Venet. Aldi, 1501. 2*l.* 5*s.* *Payne.*

————— Venetian morocco, by Roger Payne, capitals illuminated. Venet. Aldi, 1509. 9*l.* 5*s.* *Heber.*

—————, printed by Stephens in the Roman letter, red morocco, ruled. Thuanus's Autograph, Lutet. Steph. 1613. 1*l.* 16*s.* *Payne.*

—————, Lutet. Stephani, 1613. Juvenalis et Persius, Lutet. Stephani, 1613. In 1 vol. large paper, beautifully bound in blue morocco, by Roger Payne. 2*l.* 6*s.* *Triphook.*

————— Notis Bond, red morocco, fine copy Elzev. 1678. 1*l.* 5*s.* *Lepard.*

—————, red morocco, Paris, e Typographia Regia, 1733. 1*l.* 2*s.* *Clarke.*

Hours of Recreation, or the Garden of Pleasure, with divers Verses in Italian and English, collected by Sandford, fine copy, red morocco, Bynneman, 1576. 4*l.* 5*s.* *Rodd.*

Ignatius of Loyola's Life, portrait and plates, blue morocco, 1616. 3*l.* 18*s.* *Heber.*

Imagination Poetique, traduite en Vers François des Latins et Grecz, wood cuts, green morocco, Lyon, 1552. 2*l.* 15*s.* *Rice.*

Quarto.

Homeri Ilias et Odyssea, Gr. 4 vols. in 2, russiâ, with joints, the three private plates inserted. Oxon. 1800. 3*l.* 10*s.* *Payne.*

Homeri Batrachomyomachia, cum glossis interlinearibus Characterè

- rubro distinctis, Græcè, first edition, red morocco. Venetiis, Leonicus Cretensis, 1486. 6l. *Payne*.
- Homeri Speculum Heroicum principis omnium temporum Poetarum. Les 24 Livres d'Homere reduits en Tables demonstratives Figurées, par Crispin de Passe. Trajecti, 1613. 1l. 12s. *Triphook*.
- Homer's Iliades (Ten Books of), translated out of French by Arthur Hall, black letter, with MS. notes by G. Steevens, russia, rare. R. Newberie, 1581. 11l. *Rice*.
- Horace's Satyres Englysshed accordyng to the Prescription of Saint Hierome, by T. Brant, first edition, blue morocco, very rare. Thomas Marshie, 1566. 3l. *Triphook*.
- Huon. Les Prouesses et Faictz du tres preulx noble et vaillant Huon de Bourdeaulx, Per de France, Duc de Guyenne, black letter. Lyon, sans date. 3l. 4s. *Triphook*.
- Hylton's Scala Perfectionis, blue morocco, very fine copy, Wynken de Worde, 1533. 7l. *Triphook*.
- Hylton. Hereafter foloweth a devoute Boke, compyled by Mayster Walter Hylton, to a devoute Man in temperall estate, how he shulde rule him, &c. black letter, blue morocco, very rare. R. Pynson, 1506. 4l. 4s. *Longman*.
- Irelande, the Image of, with a Discoverie of the Irish Woodharne, and their notable aptnesse, celeritie, &c. to Rebellion, made by Jhon Derricke, in Verse, russia, rare, Lond. J. Daie, 1581. 13l. *Rodd*.
- Jeronomi. Incipit Expositio Sancti Jeronimi in Simbolum Apostolorum ad Papam Laurentum, of very great rarity, in a blue morocco case. Explicit Expositio S. Jeronimi impressa Oxonie et finita, 1468. 28l. *Payne*.
- The first book printed at the University of Oxford. See the discussions respecting the genuineness of the date in the Bibliotheca Spenceriana, and in Mr. Singer's pamphlet.
- Jerom, the Lyf of Saint, printed by Wyukyn de Worde, with Caxton's Device, russia, no date. 4l. 16s. *Rodd*.
- Johannis de Hese, Presbyteri a Hierusalem, Itinerarius Anno 1489, describens Dispositiones Terrarum-Insularum, &c. et varii Tractatus de Indorum Moribus, et de Presbyteri Rege, blue morocco. Impressi Daventriæ per me Richardum Pastraer, 1499. 3l. 15s. *Dibdin*.
- Johannis de Garlandia Synonima, cum Expositione Magistri Galfridi Anglici, Lond. per Ricardum Pynson, 1509.—Joannis de Garlandia Multorum Vocabulorum Equivocorum Interpretatio, Ric. Pynson, 1514, in one volume, scarce. 5l. 15s. 6d. *Dibdin*.

Folio.

Heritier Stirpes novæ aut minus cognitæ, large paper, with a

double set of plates, one set first impressions and the other beautifully coloured, with gold borders to each plate, 2 vols. elegantly bound in russia, with joints, Par. 1784. 17*l.* 17*s.* *Triphook.*

Histoire Universelle qui traite de tous les Royaumes et des Roys qui ont régné depuis la Creation du Monde jusques a la Destruction de Jherusalem. 22*l.* 1*s.* *Longman.*

A magnificent Manuscript of the fifteenth Century, upon vellum. It contains 360 leaves, 98 miniatures, and about 500 illuminated capitals. The six large illuminations, one of which represents the landing of the Romans in Britain, are painted with great boldness and splendour of colouring, red morocco.

Histoire Merveilleuse du Grand Empereur de Tartarie, nommé le Grand Chan, black letter, wood cuts, fine copy, in green morocco, extremely rare. Par. 1524. 15*l.* 15*s.* *Triphook.*

Hogarth's Original Works, russia. Boydell, 1790. 14*l.* 3*s.* 6*d.* *Knell.*

Holbein, Œuvres de, ou Recueil de Gravures d'après ses plus Beaux Ouvrages, avec sa Vie, par C. de Mechel, 4 parts, fine impressions, russia. Basle, 1780. 5*l.* *Anderdon.*

Holland, Herologia Anglica, 2 vols. in 1, fine impressions of the plates, russia, 1620. 10*l.* 5*s.* *Cochrane.*

Hollinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland, with the Castrations, 3 vols. russia, 1586. 9*l.* 9*s.* *Alexander.*

Horatii Odæ, Satyræ, et Epistolæ, cum scholiis. A Manuscript of the Twelfth Century, upon vellum, the first twelve Odes supplied in MS. of the fifteenth Century, russia. 10*l.* 10*s.* *Payne.*

Horatii Carmina, cum Commentariis, wood cuts, red morocco, fine copy. Argent. Gruninger, 1498. 3*l.* 3*s.* *Bentham.*

Horatii Carmina, fine copy, russia. Mediolani apud Alex. Minutianum, 1502. 1*l.* 3*s.* *Heber.*

TWELFTH DAY'S SALE.

Ostavo et Infra.

Jesu Christi Vita juxta quatuor Evangelistarum Narrationes, artificio graphices eleganter picta, &c. wood cuts, blue morocco. Antv. apud Crômme, 1537. 1*l.* 5*s.* *Clarke.*

Justiniani Institutionum Libri quatuor, large paper, very fine copy, green morocco, with joints, from Col. Stanley's Collection. Lugd. Bat. 1671. 5*l.* 10*s.* *Payne.*

Kelton's Chronycle, with a Genealogie declaryng that the Brittons and Welshemen are lineally descended from Brute, in Verse black letter, very rare, red morocco, fine copy. R. Grafton, 1547. 13*l.* 10*s.* *Heber.*

- Knox's Copie of a Lettre delivered to the Ladie Marie, Regent of Scotland, blue morocco. Geneva, 1558. 3l. 16s. *Rodd.*
 Knox, Sermon preached by John Knox, in Edenbrough in 1565, blue morocco. 1566. 2l. 7s. *Heber.*
 Knox's Answer to a Letter of a Jesuit named Tyrie, blue morocco, Imprintit at Sanctandrois, by Lekprevik, 1572. 2l. 8s. *Rodd.*
 Lachrymæ Musarum. The Tears of the Muses exprest in Elegies upon the Death of Henry Lord Hastings, with frontispiece, 1649. 3l. 3s. *Warder.*

Quarto.

- Landon Vies et Œuvres des Peintres les plus célèbres, savoir, Doméniquin, Raphael, et Poussin, 9 vols. plates in outline, elegantly bound in fawn-coloured morocco, with joints. Par. 1805-9. 38l. 17s. *Lord Yarmouth.*
 Lascaris Grammatica Græca, cum interpretatione Latina, russia, first book printed by Aldus. Venet. Aldus, 1495. 3l. 16s. *Heber.*
 Letters of such True Saintes and Holy Martyrs of God, as in the late bloodye persecution, gave their lyves for the defence of Christe's Holy Gospel, black morocco. John Day, 1564. 5l. 7s. 6d. *Clarke.*
 Livre (Le) des trois filz de Roy, c'est assavoir de France, d'Angleterre, et d'Escoce, lesquelz au service du Roy de Secille eurent de glorieuses victoires contre les Turcz, &c. wood cuts, black letter. Lyon, 1508. 6l. 6s. *Hibbert.*

Folio.

- Ireland. A full and explanatory account of the Shaksperian Forgery, by myself the Writer, William Henry Ireland.
 Ireland's own Manuscript, containing his Original Documents, Contracts, and Indentures of Shakspeare, and his Love Verses to Anne Hatherway, with a lock of his hair; illustrated with drawings by Westall, the Irelands, &c. portraits and engravings of many of the principal persons and places mentioned by Shakspeare. The whole bound in one volume, and containing a very interesting account of a literary imposition, which deceived several eminent persons. 30l. 9s. *Jervis.*
 Jason et Médée (Le Roman de) par Raoul le Fevre, an ancient edition in a large type, in double columns, red morocco, the first six leaves manuscript, very rare, no place or date. 17l. 10s. *Triphook.*
 Jason. A Boke of the Hoole Lyf of Jason, green morocco, excessively rare, printed by William Caxton about (1475.) 85l. 1s. *Triphook.*

- "This volume is among the scarcest and most interesting of those which owe their first existence, in an English form, to the pen and press of Caxton."—Bibl. Spenceriana, V. 4.
- Jehan de Saintré, Hystoyre et plaicente Cronique du Petit Jehan de Saintré, black letter, wood cuts, russia, very rare. Par. Michel le Noir, 1517. 20l. 9s. 6d. *Hibbert.*
- Jourdain, Les faitz et prouesses du noble et vaillant Chevalier Jourdain de Blaves, black letter, fine copy, russia, rare. Par. Michel le Noir, 1520. 23l. 12s. 6d. *Hibbert.*
- Justiniani Institutiones, cum Scholiis. A beautiful manuscript of the fourteenth century, upon vellum, with miniatures and illuminated capital letters, in very fine preservation, in crimson velvet. 10l. *Payne.*
- Juvenalis et Persii Satyræ, fine copy, in russia. Mediolani apud A. Minutianum, sine anno. 1l. 11s. 6d. *Triphook.*

THIRTEENTH DAY'S SALE.

Octavo et Infra.

- I. Letter sent by J. B. unto his very frende Maister R. C. wherin is contained a large discourse of the peopling and inhabiting the cuntry called the Ardes, and other adjacent in the North of Ireland and taken in hand by Sir Thomas Smith, black letter, unlaid in 4to. russia, rare. H. Binnemann. 10l. *Rodd.*
- II. Lewis's Life of Maystre Wyllyam Caxton, portrait, blue morocco, 1737. 3l. 8s. *Triphook.*
- III. Murgia Græca, a Field, large paper, blue morocco, Cantab. 1665. 2l. *Hollingworth.*
- IV. Historia ex recensione Heinsiana, 3 vol. Elzevir, 1634. 1l. 1s. *Hayes.*
- V. Alia Editio, cum notis Gronovii, 4 vol. blue morocco, Elzevir. 1615. 1l. 19s. *Hayes.*
- VI. Historia ex recensione Gronovii, fine copy, russia, ib. 1678. 2l. *Payne.*
- VII. Historia cura Ernesti, 5 vol. Lipsiæ, 1785. 1l. 11s. 6d. *Payne.*
- VIII. Longus, Les Amours Pastorales de Daphnis et Chloe, plates, ruled, elegantly bound in morocco, in compartments, by Monnier, Paris, 1752. 2l. 8s. *Triphook.*
- IX. Lucani Pharsalia cum familiari atque perlucida Annotatione Petri Deponte cæci Brugensis, with ornamented capitals, red morocco, Parrhisiis, Lerouge, 1512. 4l. 4s. *Lloyd.*
- X. Lyndewode (Wilhelmi) Constitutiones Provinciales Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, very fine copy, blue morocco, Wynandum de Worde, 1496. 4l. 5s. *Triphook.*

Quarto.

Lucani Pharsalia cum notis Variorum curante Oudendorpio, russia, Lugd. Bat. 1728. 2l. *Hayes.*

———— Grotii et Bentleii, red morocco, with joints, Strawberry Hill, 1760. 2l. *Triphook.*

Luciani Opera, Gr. et Lat. cum notis Hemsterhuisii et Reitzii, 4 vol. Amstel. 1743. 4l. 14s. 6d. *Payne.*

Lucretius de Rerum Natura, cura G. Wakefield, 3 vol. large paper, elegantly bound in green morocco, Londini, 1796. 29l. 8s. *Barclay.*

Ludolphi de Suchen liber de Terra Sancta et Itinerario Iherosolimitano et de aliis mirabilibus quæ in mari conspiciuntur, videlicet mediterraneo, black letter, very fine copy, blue morocco, rare, sine ulla notâ. 10l. 15s. *Clarke.*

Lydgate. The Tale of the Chorle and the Byrd. Emprintyd by me, Richarde Pinson, no date, extremely rare. Not mentioned by Ames, Herbert, or Dibdin, red morocco. 17l. 17s. *Triphook.*

Lydgate. Lyfe of our Lady, very fine copy, blue morocco, rare, R. Redman, 1531. 17l. 5s. *Triphook.*

Folio.

Knyght of the Toure, translated oute of the Frenssh into our Maternall Englysshe tongue, by me William Caxton, 1483 85l. 1s. *Triphook.*

A very fine copy of a book which rarely occurs perfect, splendidly bound in green morocco, with morocco lining, &c.

Lambert's Description of the Genus Pinus, illustrated with figures, directions relative to the cultivation, and remarks on the uses of the several species, with the plates beautifully coloured, of which the number was very small, 1805. 30l. 19s. 6d. *Cl. Scott.*

Lancelot du Lac, Le Roman de, 3 vol. wood cuts, black letter, fine copy, green morocco, Paris, Jehan Petit, 1520. 11l. 5s. *Longman.*

Le Brun Galerie des Peintres Flamands, Hollandois, et Allemands, ouvrage enrichi de 201 planches d'après les meilleurs tableaux de ces Maîtres, 3 vols. very fine impressions of the plates, Paris, 1792. 31l. 10s. *Lord Yarmouth.*

Le Brun Voyages par la Moscovie en Perse, et aux Indes Orientales, 2 vols. Amst. 1718. Voyage au Levant, Paris, 1714, together 3 vols. large paper, blue morocco. 17l. 6s. 6d. *Payne.*

Legenda Aurea, The Golden Legend, Fynysshed the 27 day of August the yere of our Lord 1527. Imprynted at London in Fleete Strete at the sygne of the Sonne by Wynken de Worde, elegantly bound in blue morocco. 15l. 4s. 6d. *Thompson.*

Lisuarte. El Octavo Libro de Amadis: que trata de las estranas avêturas y grandes proezas desuniêto Lisuarte, y de la muerte del inclito rey Amadis, en Castellano por Juan Diaz, Sevilla, 1526.—El noveno Libro de Amadis de Gaula: qui es la cronica del Cavallero de la ardiente espada Amadis de Grecia; hijo de Lisuarte, Sevilla, 1542, 2 vols. in 1, wood cuts, fine copies, yellow morocco, very rare. 15*l.* *Triphook.*

FOURTEENTH DAY'S SALE.

Octavo et Infra.

Marguerite Reine de Navarre, Nouvelles de, 3 vol. large paper, fine impressions of the plates, Berne, 1780. 5*l.* 15*s.* 6*d.* *Chamier.*

Margaret de Valoys, Queen of Navarre's Heptameron, or the History of the Fortunate Lovers, scarce, 1654. 2*l.* 8*s.* *Triphook.*

Marguerites de la Marguerite des Princesses tres illustre Royne de Navarre, 2 vols. in 1, fine copy of the best edition, rare, Lyon, 1547. 2*l.* 15*s.* *Triphook.*

Marguerite, Le Tombeau de Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre, fine copy, green morocco, Paris, 1551. 3*l.* *Heber.*

Marlborough, The Opinions of Sarah Duchess-Dowager of Marlborough, 1788. 1*l.* 10*s.* *Molteno.*

Mary Queen of Scots. Buchanan's Detection of the Duings of Marie-Queene of Scottes, touchand the murder of hir husband, and hir conspiracie, adulterie and pretended mariage with the Erle of Bothwell, black letter, no date. 2*l.* 16*s.* *Heber.*

————— Martyre de la Royne d'Escosse, Douairiere de France, avec son Oraison Funebre, blue morocco, rare, Edimbourg. 1588. 1*l.* 19*s.* *Rodd.*

Medici (Lorenzo di) Stanze Belissime et ornatissime intitulate Le Selve d'Amore, fine copy, yellow morocco, with joints, very rare, Venet. Rusconi, 1522. 5*l.* 10*s.* *Heber.*

Meichsneri Thesaurus Sapientiae Civilis sive Vitae Humanæ ac Virtutum et Vitiõrum Theatrum, plates, fine copy, green morocco, Francof. 1626. 2*l.* 19*s.* *Clarke.*

Melancton. The Epistle of Philip Melancton, made unto oure late Sovereign Lord Kynge, Henry the eight, for revoking and abolishing of the Six Articles, &c. black letter, rare, Printed at Weesell, 1547. 2*l.* 18*s.* *Hibbert.*

Melandri Jocorum et Seriorum Centuriæ aliquot, 2 vols. red morocco, ruled, Francof. 1626. 1*l.* 16*s.* *Perry.*

Menagii Poemata, red morocco, with joints, uncut, Elzevir, 1663. 4*l.* 10*s.* *Clarke.*

Merlino, Historia di, wood cuts, red morocco, rare, Venetia, per Roffinelli, 1539. 4*l.* 14*s.* 6*d.* *Heber.*

Quarto.

- Marcus. Evangelium secundum Marcum cum glossis. A Manuscript of the 13th Century, upon vellum, blue morocco, with joints. 1l. 15s. *Triphook.*
- Marcus Paulus de Venetiis de Consuetudinibus et Conditionibus Orientalium regionum, very fine copy, blue morocco, extremely rare, sine ulla notâ. 10l. 10s. *Payne.*
- Marguerite de Valois Royné de Navarre, l'Heptameron des Nouvelles, scarce, Paris, 1560. 2l. 15s. *Triphook.*
- Martialis Epigrammata cum Vita Calderini, fine copy, sine ulla nota. The character resembles that used by Vindelin de Spira in his Dante of 1477. 4l. 4s. *Triphook.*
- Martin de Cordova. Jardin de las nobles Donzellas, fine copy, rare, 1542. 10l. 5s. *Payne.*
- Möyn's Universal Conchologist, exhibiting the figure of every known Shell, accurately drawn and painted after nature, 2 vols. 160 plates, red morocco, 1789. 20l. *M. Hey.*
- Mary of Nemmegen. Here begynneth a lyttell story that was of a twetthe done in the lande of Gelders of a Mayde that was named Mary of Nemmegen that was the dyvels paramoure by the space of VII yere longe, wood cuts, extremely rare. Imprinted at Antwarpe by me Iohn Duisbrowghe. 42l. *Longman.*
- Mary Queene of Scots. A Defence of the Honorable Sentence and Execution of the Queene of Scots, together with the Answer to certaine objections made by some of her Favourites, fine copy, morocco, ruled, rare, London, Iohn Windet, 1587. 6l. 6s. *Hibbert.*
- Matheolus. Le Livre de Matheolus qui nous monstre sans varier les biens et les vertus qui vieignent pour soy marier, wood cuts, red morocco, sans date. 2l. 12s. 6d. *Triphook.*
- Meisneri Thesaurus Philo-Politicus, 2 vol. plates, Francofurti, 1624. 1l. 19s. *Clarke.*
- Meliadus. Histoire des hauts et chevalereux faicts d'armes du Prince Meliadus dit le Chevalier de la Croix, fils unique de Maximian Empereur des Allemaignes, morocco, Paris, Boufons, 1584. 2l. *Arch.*
- Mercerii Emblemata Latinis versibus explicata, blue morocco, 1592. 1l. 11s. *Clarke.*
- Mercurie's Message, or the copy of a Letter sent to Archbishop Laud, 1641. An Answer to Mercurie's Message, 1641. Mercurie's Message defended, 1641, 3 vol. 1l. 5s. *Taylor.*
- Merlino, La Vita de, et de le sue Prophetie historiade, wood cuts, black morocco, Venetia, 1507. 3l. 10s. *Triphook.*
- Merlin. Sensuit les Prophecies de Merlin, black letter, blue morocco, Paris, 1528. 2l. 19s. *Triphook.*

Milton's *Paradise Lost and Regained*, 2 vol. blue morocco, Baskerville, 1759. 3l. 4s. *Triphook.*

Folio.

Livre (Le) des Fais d'armes et de Chevalerie, wood cuts, fine, copy green morocco, very rare, Paris, par Anthoine Verard, 1488. 18l. *Triphook.*

Loggan *Oxonia Illustrata*, fine copy, splendidly bound in russia with joints, Oxon. 1675. 6l. 12s. 6d. *Knell.*

Luis de Escobar. *Las quatrocientas Respuestas con las ciento Glosas o Declaraciones assi en Prosa como en Metra*, Valladolid en Casa de Fernandez de Cordova, 1550. La Segunda Parte de las quatrocientas Respuestas, Valladolid, 2 vols. very rare, russia, 1552. 75l. 12s. *Hibbert.*

Lyf of our Lady, made by dan John Lydgate, Enprynted by Wyllyam Caxton, no date. 17l. *Triphook.*

This Copy wants the Table and six leaves at the end.

Mabillon de *Re Diplomatica cum Supplemento*, large paper, Paris, 1581. 3l. 18s. *Payne.*

Mabrian. *Histoire singuliere et fort recreative contenant le reste des faitz et gestes des quatre filz Aymon, &c. semblablement La Cronique et hystoire du chevaleureux prince Mabrian, Roy de Hierusalem*, first edition, wood cuts, fine copy, blue morocco, rare, Paris, par J. Nyverd, pour Galliot du Pré. 19l. 19s. *Hibbert.*

Madien. *La conqueste de Grece faicte par le trespreux et redouté en chevalerie Philippe de Madien*, fine copy, blue morocco, rare, Paris, 1527. 17l. 6s. 6d. *Lung.*

Mandeville. *Cy Commence le Livre des parties d'outre mer le quel fut fait et ordonné par Messire Jehan de Mandeville. Chevalier qui fut nes en Angleterre dans la ville que on dist Saint Albain.* A splendid Manuscript of the 15th Century, upon vellum; the first page contains a large Miniature, beautifully painted with borders of flowers, &c. and the Arms of the person for whom it was written. The capital letters illuminated. Elegantly bound in red morocco, by Hering. 25l. 4s. *Triphook.*

Manerbi *Legendi di tutti li Santi della Romana Sedia*, blue morocco, Venet. N. Jenson, senz' anno. 3l. *Longman.*

Marmol, *Descripcion General de Affrica*, 3 vol. red morocco. The third volume is very scarce, Grenada, 1573, et Malaga, 1599. 16l. 16s. *Payne.*

Martial d'Auvergne, *Les Vigilles de la Mort de Charles VII.* wood cuts, fine copy, Par. Pierre le Caron, sans date. 3l. 3s. *Triphook.*

- Masson *Stapelix Novæ*, or a Collection of several new Species of that Genus discovered in the interior of Africa, coloured plates, russia, with joints, 1796. 4l. 10s. *Cl. Scott.*
- Masuccio, *Il Novellino*, nel quale si contengono cinquanta novelle, wood cuts, fine copy, green morocco, very rare, Venet. Greg. de. Gregorii 1492. 9l. *Triphook.*
- Meliadus, *Les Nobles Faits d'Armes du Vaillant Roi Meliadus de Leounoys*, black letter, fine copy, blue morocco, Paris, D. Janot. 1532. 8l. 10s. *Triphook.*
- Melusine, *L'Histoire de*, nouvellement corrigée, wood cuts, fine copy, russia, very rare, Paris, Pierre le Caron, sans date. 24l. 3s. *Hibbert.*

FIFTEENTH DAY'S SALE.

Octavo et Infra.

- Meygra *Entrepriza catoliqui Imperatoris*, quando de Anno domini mille ccccxxvi. veniebat per provensam bene corrossatus impostam prendere fransam, &c. per A. Arenam, original edition, red morocco, rare, Avenione, 1537. 2l. 2s. *Triphook.*
- Meyuier, *la Naissance et les Triomphes esmerveillables du Dieu Bacchus*, plates, blue morocco. 2l. 2s. *Triphook.*
- Milton's *Paradise Lost*, cuts, Addison's copy, Tonson, 1711. 3l. *Wellesley.*

Manuscripts of the Bible, &c. Missals, and Offices of the Church.

- The Book of Psalms, on vellum, red morocco. 1l. 7s. *Heber.*
 July 26, 1728. Examined this MS. by Wickliff's Bible in Queen's Colledge, Oxon. and find it the same. Jo. Ames.
 See Note.
- Les Sept Pseaumes de la Penitence. A modern MS. on vellum, delicately written, with the capitals illuminated in gold, and each page surrounded by a gold border, red morocco, with blue morocco lining. 3l. 13s. 6d. *Jarman.*
- Explication de l'Oraison Dominicale Présentée à Monseigneur, le Prince de Galles. Beautifully written on vellum, by Berthelet, in 1692, for Prince James, son of James the Second, with eight highly coloured and splendid miniatures. Each page is encircled with a border of gold, bound in red morocco, with the Royal Arms. 9l. 4s. *Triphook.*
- Epistolæ Sancti Pauli ad Romanos*, &c. a beautiful specimen of Calligraphy, on vellum, with illuminated capitals and gold borders to all the pages, bound in red morocco. At the beginning of the volume is the following note: "The two Paintings in

this Book of St. Paul and St. Jerome, with the Flowers and Insects on the borders, were painted by the celebrated French Artist, Marolles, and the MS. was written by the famous Writing Master, Monchaussée." 18l. *Triphook.*

Missale Ecclesiæ Romanæ cum Psalmis, MS. of the Fifteenth Century, upon vellum, with 45 miniatures, and painted borders, and Arms of the Family for whom it appears to have been executed, red morocco, with clasps. 6l. 12s. *Arch.*

Officium B. M. Virginis cum Calendario, with 16 paintings and borders of flowers, &c. bound in satin. 8l. 8s. *Jarman.*

secundum Consuetudinem Romanæ Curie, a beautiful MS. of the Fifteenth Century, on vellum, with illuminated capitals, and borders of flowers. It contains ten miniatures, very splendidly executed, which are said to have been painted by Girolamo, the son of Francesco dai Libri, bound in crimson satin, with silver gilt ornaments, &c. with a Virgin and Child engraved on silver on one side. 16l. 5s. 6d. *Triphook.*

Missale sive Officium Beatæ M. Virginis cum Calendario. 110l. 5s. *Jarman.*

A very beautiful Book of Offices, executed at Bruges in 1531. It contains 32 miniatures of the Birth and Passion of Christ, of the Twelve Apostles, &c. painted with a taste and delicacy of execution far superior to the generality of Flemish Missals. The Calendar is also ornamented with appropriate emblematic devices to each month. It is said to have been executed for the celebrated Diana of Poitiers. It concludes thus: "Author ac scriptor hujus operis presentis nomen est ei, Antonius Van Damme moram trahens Brugis anno 1531," bound in red velvet, enclosed in a silver gilt fillagree case, and a blue morocco case.

Officium Beatæ Mariæ Virginis cum Calendario. A beautiful specimen of Italian Calligraphy of the beginning of the Sixteenth Century. It has 16 large miniatures very splendidly painted and illuminated with arabesque borders to the opposite pages, in gold and colours. In very rich old morocco binding, in compartments with clasps, in the finest preservation. 32l. 6s. *Clarke.*

Missale Romanum, printed upon vellum, with illuminations and engraved borders, a very fine copy in old binding in compartments, ruled, Paris, Simon Vostre, sans date. 5l. 15s. 6d. *Triphook.*

Horæ Beatissimæ Virginis Mariæ, printed upon vellum, with coloured plates, and illuminated capitals, bound in old morocco, with morocco lining, in compartments, Antwerp, Plantin, 1570. 3l. 3s. *Arch.*

Mors. The Complaynt of Roderyck Mors, somtyme a gray fryre,

unto the parliament howse of England, his natural cuntry, excessively rare, inlaid, russia, Imprinted at Savoy, per Franciscum de Turona, no date. 5*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.* *Payne.*

Musick, The Praise of, (by Joseph Barnes), green morocco, black letter, Oxenford, 1586. 3*l.* *Triphook.*

Quarto.

Mirroure, (The) of Majestie or Badges of Honour conceitedly emblazoned with emblems annexed, poetically unfolded, red morocco, rare, W. Jones, 1619. 18*l.* *Perry.*

Missals and Offices of the Church, &c.

A Manuscript of the 15th century upon vellum, in a glass case, one side of which contains the Horæ Beatæ Mariæ Virginis, the other, Precationes Christo et Matri. 5*l.* 15*s.* 6*d.* *Booth.*

Missale in Lingua Germanica, a MS. of the 15th century, upon vellum, with nine large Paintings, and Capitals tastefully illuminated, bound in velvet. 10*l.* *Jarman.*

Precationes Pie, a MS. on vellum, with nine large splendidly painted Miniatures and borders of flowers to each page, red morocco. 13*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* *Triphook.*

Missale Romanum cum Festis Sanctorum et Calendario, a Manuscript of the 14th century upon vellum. It contains a great many Miniatures painted in a very curious and fanciful Style of Illumination. Each Month of the Calendar is ornamented with appropriate Emblematical Devices. See MS. note at the beginning, red morocco. 7*l.* 17*s.* 6*d.* *Arch.*

Missale Ecclesiæ Romanæ, a very beautiful Flemish Manuscript of the 15th century upon vellum. It has 21 large Miniatures, which are painted (especially the Figures of the Apostles) with a correctness and delicacy of finish very rarely seen in Missals of this description, bound in red velvet, with gold ornaments, and a blue morocco case. 57*l.* 15*s.* *Triphook.*

Officium Beatæ Mariæ Virginis secundum Consuetudinem Romanæ Curiae, cum Calendario. A most splendid Manuscript of the beginning of the 16th century, upon vellum. It contains six large Miniatures with Groups of figures, &c. on the borders of a very brilliant and elaborate execution. The Capital Letters are also richly illuminated with figures, &c. and the Signs of the Zodiack are painted to each month of the Calendar, bound in blue velvet, with gold ornaments, in a red morocco case. 53*l.* 11*s.* *Triphook.*

Psalterium Latine, a Manuscript of the 15th century, upon vellum, with very delicate Paintings of Groups of Figures and Landscapes,

in the Capital Letters, and Borders richly illuminated with Figures, Candelabras, &c. 18*l.* *Triphook.*

- Moor's Hindu Pantheon, plates, russia, 1810. 4*l.* 14*s.* 6*d.* *Cochran.*
 Morlini Novellæ, first edition, very fine copy, morocco, from the Roxburghe Collection, extremely rare, Neapoli, in ædibus Joan. Pasquet de Sallo, 1520. 19*l.* 19*s.* *Triphook.*
 Muld-Sacke, or the Apologie of Hic Mulier to the late Declamation against her, portrait on the Title, russia, rare, 1620. 6*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* *Clarke.*

Folio.

- Merlin, Les Prophecies de, fine copy, from the Roxburghe Collection, rare, Paris, Verard, 1498. 9*l.* 9*s.* *Triphook.*
 Milles et Amys, le quel raconte les gestes et hauts fais du chevalier Miles tres renommé et de Amys, &c. wood cuts, fine copy, very rare, Paris, Verard, sans date. 16*l.* 16*s.* *Hibbert.*
 Missale Ecclesiæ Noviomensis, a Manuscript upon vellum of great antiquity. It is of an oblong form, and appears by the Capital Letters and singular Illuminations to have been written in the 11th Century, bound in red velvet. 5*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.* *Payne.*
 Missale ad Usus Ecclesiæ Portugallensis. A most splendid Manuscript upon vellum, executed in 1557, for John the Fourth, King of Portugal, and Catherine his Queen. It contains above a Thousand Illuminations painted with a great variety, richness and brilliancy of colouring, and each page is surrounded with a border and other ornaments of gold, bound in red morocco. 35*l.* 14*s.* *Triphook.*
 Monde. L'Œuvre qui a pour Titre Le Monde plein de Fols, curious grotesque plates, with borders after designs by Van Sasse, with descriptions in French, German, and Dutch verse, no date. 4*l.* 4*s.* *Sir J. G. Egerton.*
 Myrrour of the World, or thymage of the same, first edition, two leaves wanting, and two supplied by Manuscript, red morocco, William Caxton, 1481. 15*l.* *Triphook.*
 Myrrour of the World, wood cuts, second edition, very fine copy, in blue morocco, William Caxton, 1481. 55*l.* 13*s.* *Triphook.*
 Mystere des Actes des Apostres, 2 vol. in 1. black letter, wood cuts, red morocco, Paris, par N. Cousteau, 1537. 7*l.* 10*s.* *Triphook.*
 Mystere de la Conception et Nativité de la Vierge Marie avec la Nativité, &c. de Jesus Christ, 3 Mysteries in 1 vol. wood cuts, fine copy, blue morocco, Par M. le Noir, 1507. 15*l.* *Triphook.*
 Napoleon, Tableaux Historiques de ses Campagnes en Italie, plates, russia, Paris, 1806. 10*l.* *Sir J. G. Egerton.*
 Ordonnances de l'Ordre de la Toison d'Or, beautifully printed upon vellum, red morocco, in a red morocco case, Le Noir, 1523. 11*l.* 4*s.* *Triphook.*

ON THE
ORIGIN, PROGRESS, PREVALENCE, AND
DECLINE OF IDOLATRY.

BY THE REV. GEORGE TOWNSEND.

PART I.

SECTION I.

Preliminary Observations, and Notice of the chief Works on the subject.

FEW subjects are so interesting to the unlearned and the learned ; to the philosopher, the sceptic, and the Christian, as the origin, the progress, and the once universal prevalence of Idolatry. Accustomed by the common laws of society, in the present day, to morality, gravity, and decency of manners, we can scarcely imagine the possibility of the existence of a state, in which inhuman and deliberate murder, and the most infamous and scandalous abominations could have formed a part of the public religion of a country. We seem to contemplate the idiocy of the human mind, when the confused rabble of the heathen Gods, with their long train of "Gorgons, Hydras, and Chimæras dire," pass before us in rapid, monstrous succession. The absurd, inconsistent, and apparently unaccountable traditions, which were alike believed by the vulgar, and with few exceptions even by the philosophical part of mankind, excite only our scorn ; and we pity the blindness and ignorance which bowed at their altars, and were instructed these "Devils to adore for Deities."

Few, who have been initiated in the elements of classical knowledge, have not felt, at some period of their youthful studies, an intense eagerness to be well acquainted with the meaning of the fables of the Pantheon. We all remember, how much the general curiosity of a whole school has been excited, by any attempt to elucidate the histories of the Gods and Goddesses of Greece and Rome. The very unsatisfactory explanations even of Tooke's Pantheon, or those in Dr. Lempriere's Dictionary, served only to increase the desire of information which they could not gratify ; we were perplexed and bewildered ; and were at length compelled to defer the examination of the question to an indefinite period, which seldom or never arrived. So strong however are the early impressions of youth, that very few lose entirely the wish to unravel the strange details which formerly contributed to their amusement, or roused their boyish wonder.

The subject of the Pagan Idolatry, too, is not merely interesting ;

it has far higher claims to our attention—it is of real importance to every man, who would comprehend the ways of Providence ; the object of the Mosaic law ; the external evidence of the Truth of the Hebrew Scriptures, deducible from the History of Paganism ; and the wonderful connexion between anticipated History in Prophecy, and accomplished Prophecy in History. The books of the Old Testament give us an account of the early Religion of the world—the gradual dispersion of all nations from their primeval settlements—with many other events in which the whole of the human race must have been deeply concerned, and which they must have witnessed when they were but few in number. They give us a simple detail of events, which are to be believed or rejected from the same reasoning, by which we should judge of the truth or falschood of the records of nations in general. As the foreign events of the History of England might be authenticated from an accurate detail of the transactions of the surrounding people ; so will the facts related in the books of Moses, and the Prophets, be confirmed by the records, the superstitions, and worship of the neighbouring idolaters. The history of one nation is “ indented and dove-tailed into that of another.” If the earlier histories contained in the pages of Scriptures be true, we shall necessarily find some traces of the important events there related among the pristine annals of every nation.

If then the ancient prevalence of idolatry be proved, and if the identity of the facts on which it is founded, with the events related in Scripture be ascertained, we have additional reason to believe after a consideration of both systems, that the Deity created man, and imparted to him a Revelation ; we are warranted in rejecting the corruptions of that Revelation, which encourage the degradation of women, the exposure of infants, the slaughter of human victims, and the public perpetration of every unmentionable infamy ; while we retain the purity of that system which inculcates mercy, justice, and love. From this preliminary we are led to the unavoidable inference, that Christianity is the gift of the same Creator, who placed our primary ancestors on the earth.

Of so much importance then is it that every man, who would be satisfied that Revelation is the gift of God, should be well informed on the subject of the Pagan Idolatry. *Our Religion is founded upon facts. If the facts of Scripture be proved to be true all theoretical objections must vanish.* Gibbon may point his irony, and Hume may fatigue himself with arguments against the probability of miracles ; the disciples of Paine, and the shallow admirers of the superficial Frenchman, may discover ten thousand imaginary difficulties ; but until *the facts are disproved*, and the united testimony of every nation that has retained a remnant of civilisation be discredited, the authenticity of Scripture cannot be overthrown. The Deity has condescended in all ages to confirm the truth of this

Revelation by appealing to our senses ; and as the existence of the scattered sons of Israel, and the gradual fulfilment of Prophecy, appeal to our reason at the present time ; so did the very idolatries of the Pagans, which were merely the corruption of Truth, strengthen the conviction of believers, in their attachment to the Hebrew Scriptures.

From thus considering the importance and interest of the subject, and having perused with some attention the works of Maurice, Bryant, Faber, the papers of Sir William Jones and Captain Wilford in the *Asiatic Researches*, with some other works, I had intended to have drawn up the result of this reading in one or two small volumes, and submitted them to the world. The information collected, and the subjects discussed by the several authors I have mentioned, extend through so many volumes, that but few persons can find leisure to peruse them throughout : an abridgment therefore of their discoveries and reasonings would be most acceptable to the great majority of readers. My engagements however are at present so numerous, that I have not an opportunity of bestowing on the subject that attention which its extent and nature requires. Yet as I shall be most happy to facilitate, even in the least degree, the labors of any one who may be inclined to attempt this task, I have drawn up some few papers for insertion in the valuable pages of the *Classical Journal*.

It is impossible to satisfy every doubt, and to anticipate every objection ; and though many of the ideas I may propose may appear new, and not yet sufficiently confirmed, I trust, as my wish is to reconcile contending theories, that I shall contribute to the more easy fulfilment of the abridgment of those larger works I have mentioned : an abridgment, the object of which ought to be an enumeration and arrangement of the wonderful proofs contained in the annals of the most remote and forgotten nations, as well as in the most detestable rites of Paganism, that the Scriptures are worthy of credit, and Revelation the gift of God.

Before we proceed however, to enquire into the Origin, Progress, and Decline of Idolatry, it will be necessary to survey the chief writers, from whom our information is principally derived. We may pass over the period which elapsed from the writings of the early Greek and Latin Fathers, till we come to the celebrated Rabbi Maimonides. Cyprian in his treatise *Idolorum de Vanitate*, Lactantius, Eusebius, Athanasius, and others declaimed, it is true, against Idolatry, but none of these celebrated men attempted to explain the fables they ridiculed. Maimonides was the first who endeavoured to solve the mysteries which had so long perplexed the world. He perused, he tells us, with great attention all the ancient authors on the Rise and Progress of Idolatry. He did this, to explain the reasons of the enactment of those ordinances, and rites of the Jewish Law which appear to have no meaning, unless they are considered

in connexion with the idolatrous customs of the surrounding nations. Among other opinions which this distinguished author defended with equal learning and talent, and which have attracted considerable attention, was this, that the worship of the heavenly host was practised by the Antediluvians. We read in Genesis in our translation, that in the days of Enos, "men began to call on the name of the Lord." The learned Lightfoot translates the passage, "then began profaneness in calling on the name of the Lord." Heidegger (in his eighth dissertation, on the Theology of the Cainites, and the Antediluvian Idolatry) adduces many arguments to prove that Idolatry was the corruption prevalent before the flood. The words of Maimonides are, "in the days of Enos men grievously erred, and the wise men became brutish; and (our author adds) from worshipping the stars as the representatives of the Deity, who had placed them on high to govern the world, men began to praise, honor, and worship them, and to esteem them as Mediators."—The idea of a Mediator indeed runs, like a thread, through the whole web of the ancient Idolatry. Mr. Young, with other celebrated men, agrees in this opinion of Maimonides.

One of the chief difficulties which present themselves to the Mosaic account, is derived from that abstruse subject, the antiquity of the Zodiac. M. Bailly in his history of Astronomy places the invention of the Persian sphere about 3200 years before Christ: he supposes likewise that the movable zodiac was discovered 2250 years before Christ: the zodiac of Esne has been referred to a still earlier period. The arguments on which these hypotheses are supported have been undoubtedly refuted. Even if the theory of M. Bailly and others be of no authority, the early perfection of astronomy at a very early period after the deluge, when the first post-diluvians must have been much occupied in choosing their new settlements, ought to have some weight in influencing our decision. Burnet justly observes in his *Archæologia*, at the conclusion of the first book, "it is reasonable to believe that the antediluvian fathers were not utterly foolish, and ignorant of the sciences. Of these, whatever they might have been, Noah was the heir," &c. Whatever the aged Patriarchs knew, was most probably communicated to Noah. He was the inhabitant of both worlds, and transferred the lamp of the sciences from one to the other. Mr. Maurice too, in his memoir on the ruins of Babylon, very justly observes (p. 22.) "the very early proficiency of the Egyptians and Chaldeans in Astronomy can only be accounted for by the supposition that a considerable portion of the antediluvian arts and sciences, among which must be numbered Astronomy, was by the permission of Providence preserved on tablets of stone to illumine the ignorance and darkness of the earliest postdiluvian ages." To suppose that

¹ I am compelled to abbreviate Mr. Maurice's long and labored sentences.

our antediluvian ancestors for sixteen hundred years together could be uninterested spectators of the celestial bodies, would be to imagine them destitute of common curiosity. Josephus too has asserted that the antediluvians were well acquainted with the grand cycle of six hundred years; which Cassini declares to be the finest period ever invented; since it brings out the solar year more exactly than that of Hipparchus and Ptolemy; and the lunar month, within about one second of what it is determined by modern astronomers," &c. &c. In addition to these evidences in favor of Maimonides's opinion, we may add the traditions so current among many nations, that there were certain sacred books preserved by the second father of mankind. These traditions are collected by Mr. Faber in the fifth chapter of his third book. "Whether any books," (says Mr. Faber) "of antediluvian science and theology were preserved by Noah in the ark, I shall not pretend to determine: yet I can see nothing very improbable in the supposition, that he may have delivered to his posterity a volume or volumes replete with the treasured knowledge of a former world." Other reasons might be brought forward. We shall however confine ourselves to one. Job seems to have been well acquainted with astronomy, and with its perversion, then commencing, to idolatrous uses.

It may be thought inconsistent with that sober judgment with which we ought to examine this controverted question, thus to declare an opinion in favor of antediluvian Idolatry, without any demonstrative proof; there yet seems to be much more evidence in support of the conjecture than possibly can be urged against it.

The patience of most readers would be exhausted with the attempt to take even a cursory view of all the writers who have discussed the subject since the revival of learning. Much curious information, has been collected by Heidegger, in his *Sacra Historia Patriarcharum*. Vossius has written two folio volumes *De Origine et Progressu Idolatriæ*. Bp. Cumberland in his "Planting of Nations" has some interesting tracts, particularly one "De Legibus Patriarcharum." Bochart's two celebrated treatises "Phaleg" and "Canaan" abound with interesting details: the work of Archbishop Tenuison is chiefly compiled from Bochart. Witsius's *Ægyptiaca* is an invaluable work: He has completely overthrown the hypothesis of Spencer and Marsham, that the Jews borrowed from the Egyptians. Burnet's *Archæologia* contains so much that deserves condemnation, that we cannot rank it so highly, as the learning and ingenuity of the author deserves. It is well worthy the perusal of the curious, though it must not be depended upon. One of the most valuable works on the subject, although little known and less appreciated, is the treatise of the Rev. Arthur Young, entitled "An Historical Dissertation on Idolatrous Corruptions in Religion," 2 Vols. 8vo. 1734. He has anticipated much of the labors of his succes-

sors, he proves the divine origin of the law of Moses, from its direct opposition to the customs of the surrounding idolaters; an argument since adopted and enforced by more modern writers.

To mention the name of Bryant, is to recal to the minds of all who are interested in these researches one of the most illustrious ornaments of our country. Distinguished alike for his love of truth, his devotion, and his dedication of himself to the acquisition of knowledge, Mr. Bryant has had the honor to be esteemed the most effective of the learned advocates of Revelation, of the last century. He conducts us safely through the labyrinth of mythology; through all the darkness of fable, and the fogs of error and superstition, till the day-star of Revelation bursts upon the view. We trace the form of knowledge through the primeval corruptions of the early post-diluvian age, through the disguises of Paganism, and the mistaken vanity of the Greeks. The earth is divided and colonised; and the predecessors of the Romans and the Greeks again survive. Though Mr. Bryant has sometimes permitted his ardor and imagination to influence his judgment; though the immense mass of learning which he has accumulated seems sometimes to extinguish the discrimination, which usually characterises him; still we are reminded only of the caution of a skilful general, who in a dangerous position makes his attack with a force so numerous, that he obtains a complete victory, though many of his troops are lost in the action. Half his arguments are useless, but the other half proves his point. His analysis of mythology is as entertaining as a Romance; to use the language of his biographer, "it is a literary phenomenon, which will remain the admiration of scholars, as long as a curiosity after antiquity shall continue to be a prevailing passion among mankind. Nothing in the ancient Greek and Roman literature, however recondite, or wherever dispersed, could escape his sagacity and patient investigation."—"This elaborate production is distinguished not only by its erudition, it is equally distinguished for its ingenuity and novelty. It departs from the commonly received systems, to a degree, which has not only never been attempted, but even thought of by any man of learning." It has been objected that he rests too much on etymology; yet an attentive student of his work will find that every important position is supported by facts, and not by etymology alone.

An accurate knowledge of Mr. Bryant's work may be declared essential to the right understanding the Origin and Progress of Idolatry. His great object was, to obtain some height or pedestal, from which he might survey the confused ocean of all "which fables yet have feigned, or fear conceived." He justly reasoned that the histories of the heathen Gods, Juno, Jupiter, &c. ought not alone to be rejected as incredible and absurd; the Heroes and Demigods, Perseus, Hercules, Osiris, Sesostris, Cadmus, &c. &c. either had no existence, or their histories were completely disguised. We will fix upon the history of the latter to give the

reader a specimen of this masterly performance. It was impossible, he justly argues, that Cadmus could be a real personage, though Bochart has endeavoured to explain and render consistent every fact related of him. "Is it credible," says Mr. Bryant, "that any person could have penetrated into the various regions whither he is supposed to have gone? To have founded colonies in Phœnicia, Cyprus, Rhodes, Thera, Thapsus, Thasus, Anaphe, Samothracia? To have twice visited the Hellespont? To have worked the mines in the Pangean, and other Mountains? To have made settlements in Eubœa, Attica, Bœotia, and Illyria? And above all to have founded temples, and a hundred cities in Libya? He settles after much wandering in Greece, where he likewise builds cities, and lives sixty-two years. Then he is made king in Illyria; and he had no "small territory in Armenia," &c. &c. &c.—By this reasoning, he is naturally led to ask, who then was Cadmus? and concludes in this, as in other questions of a similar nature that Cadmus was one of the names of the sun, the chief Deity of the Idolators. That is, that the name Cadmus, was but a term for the successive colonies of the Cadmians who proceeded from several parts of the East, to Greece, Africa, &c.; and who carried with them, civilisation, arts and arms, assumed the names of their God, and attributed to him the success of their various enterprises. The actions of Osiris, Sesostris, Perseus, &c. &c. are all of the same description as those imputed to Cadmus.

The principal question discussed by Mr. Bryant, is, Who or what was the people which was enabled to give laws, sciences, and civilisation to the world? Suffice it to say that by innumerable facts, arguments, examples, and learned illustrations, he proves them to have been all branches of one illustrious family; they were all the Sons of Ham, who under several names worshipped their ancestor; and who imposed, on their more peaceable brethren, who after the flood had betaken themselves to their appointed settlements, their own idolatrous superstitions and arbitrary laws. Mr. Faber, as we shall see, objects to this theory, but there is, in fact, but little difference between them. Mr. Bryant supposes Idolatry, Science, and War, to have originated at Shinar among the children of Ham. Mr. Faber supposes that they originated at Shinar among the apostate families of the three sons of Noah; these united in one place. Now we know from Scripture that the sons of Ham were more numerous than those of both his brethren together. Both writers therefore agree in this, that by far the greater part of mankind were corrupted at Shinar prior to their dispersion thence: and it is of little consequence whether the rest of either hypothesis be correct. The probability is, that Mr. Bryant and Mr. Faber have both supposed too much: a question however which will be soon considered. In

the course of his researches Mr. Bryant leads us in the most entertaining manner among tribes and nations, hitherto known only by name. The Tonim, the Cuthim, the Scythæ, the Indoscythæ, the Hyperboreans, and Pelasgi; the Sauromatæ, the Cyclopians, Arimaspians, and the Oritæ; the Cimmerians, and the Titans, "come like shadows, and so depart." Before the Greeks were known, or Rome was founded, these people were eminent in commerce; they had in many instances, though not perhaps to the extent supposed, erected fire towers or temples, on the coasts and headlands of Europe and Africa; they had visited under the name of Phœnicians, (a word by no means to be appropriated to the inhabitants of the country round Tyre alone,) Carthage, Spain, Britain, and the Indies. Wherever they settled they carried with them memorials of the deluge, and enclosed spaces round their temples for worship; where they compelled strangers to fight, where they offered human victims, and performed all their more odious ceremonies and games in honor of the Sun. The knowledge of these circumstances has been handed down to us through the Greeks, who changed every tradition, and disguised every circumstance at pleasure. The names of cities and towns were altered into those of individuals; the names of men became the titles of cities; and all was confounded by that inordinate vanity of the Greeks which appropriated every wonderful circumstance to their own people or nation. Hence a fire tower of Sicily among the people named Cyclopians, became the one eye of a Giant named Cyclops. Every word of harsher sound the Greeks adapted to their own ear: all the ancient knowledge, in short, of the people who colonised and possessed Europe, has been disguised or lost in the subsequent dominion of the Greeks and Romans, whose histories refer chiefly to themselves. However great, commercial, or celebrated their predecessors were, they have left no records; and all our information respecting them is gathered from fragments, verses, Scholiasts, hints, traditions, and of late years the legends of the Hindoos, which like the moss-covered ruins of towers and castles, speak only of past greatness, and long lost unrecorded glory.

Omitting all further consideration of Mr. Bryant's new and ingenious, though most erroneous and untenable mode of arguing from etymology, it is time to consider the objection to Mr. Bryant's system, which have been proposed by that greatest master and hierophant of modern days, the learned Mr. Faber.

Bryant supposes that the people, who were thus eminent and distinguished, were the descendants of Chus the Son of Ham: who continued together, contrary to the command of God at the general migration of families; but were at length dispersed over the face of the earth. They united, (after much wandering, as they would not obey the command of the Deity who appointed their

respective settlements in the plain of Shinar. In their journey thither, as well as on their arrival at this place, they were joined by numerous tribes, and discontented wanderers. They first disposed their brethren, the sons of Ashur, who had established themselves near the Euphrates. They then built the City and Tower of Babylon, but were dispersed from that city by miraculous interference. From Babylon they wandered in detached masses over every part of the world, conquering their brethren wherever they came; imposing their Religion by force; and introducing into the original patriarchal worship their own idolatries. From this source originated that wonderful uniformity, which we every where discover, between the rites, worship, and deities of the ancient idolaters wherever they were established.

Great as the merit of Mr. Bryant is, in having thus explored his way among the darkness which till his time had covered this subject; his theory is undoubtedly incorrect, when he imputes the universal similarity among the idolatries of all nations to the conquests of one dispersed and broken nation; whatever might have been its ambition, its knowledge, its wealth, or greatness. Mr. Faber's arguments on this head are irrefutable. "It could not have been," says Mr. Faber, "that the Cuthites could have compelled their brethren in every part of the World to receive their false worship, even if they had subjected them to their arms. The body may be subdued, but the habits and opinions of a nation cannot be immediately altered at the will of a conqueror. The brethren of the Cuthites too, had they dispersed, as Mr. Bryant has represented, to their several allotted habitations, by the time the Ammonians or Cuthim arrived at Shinar, would have become eminent and flourishing. Is it probable that they could have been so easily subdued, their religion changed, their worship utterly abolished, and the laws of Jehovah forsaken, by a people who had been punished by a miracle which must have confirmed the faith of those whom they thus attacked?" These difficulties are insuperable: yet, as we shall see when we examine Mr. Faber's system, the truth is most likely between the two opposite hypotheses, which these learned men have proposed, and defended.

If Mr. Bryant's chief hypothesis be thus untenable, why, it will be said, does he deserve so much applause, and what has he done for the promotion of satisfactory knowledge on the subject? I answer he has cleared away so much rubbish; he has shown how the fables of tradition melt into truth; how consistent are the early histories with the Mo. sic account; how much confirmation, in particular, is given to the history of the deluge from the singular prevalence of the arkite emblems and superstition, which from the first commemorated that event. Mr. Bryant reduced the chaos of rude materials into order; though it was, and is, reserved to others to complete his labors. By his researches alone the whole enquiry

into the origin and progress of Idolatry may be reduced to this one question, namely, Whether we have most reason to believe with Mr. Bryant, that there were two dispersions; or with Mr. Faber, that there was but one dispersion of mankind?

From Mr. Bryant our attention must be directed to the author of the *Indian Antiquities*. The devotion to his subject, the perseverance, ingenuity, and knowledge of Mr. Maurice entitle him to our admiration. At an early period of his life he commenced the study of the History, Religion, Commerce, Laws, and Government of Hindostan. He has added much to the information of his countrymen. His exertions have uniformly been directed to the support of the Christian Religion. He has confirmed by his respective discoveries the truth of the Mosaic account. His subsequent disappointment, and his indignation at the neglect he seems to have experienced, have excited no common interest. After a life of literary labor and research, these complaints are not discontinued. The last work which Mr. Maurice has submitted to the public, "*Observations on Mr. Rich's Memoir on the Ruins of Babylon*," was published by Subscription: and its Author by the bankruptcy of his bookseller has been compelled to become the vender of his own publications. His fate certainly appears to be unusually hard; neither the booksellers, nor the public, have removed the disappointment of which Mr. Maurice complains; though all will acknowledge his talent, knowledge, and merit.

Yet the British public is generous and discriminating; and I trust I shall not give offence even to Mr. Maurice in observing, that the author of the *Indian Antiquities*, from the mere want of a little common sense, has been in great measure the cause of his own failure. The style in which his works are written, is so pompous and labored, that it is with the utmost difficulty the most curious and anxious reader can toil through its redundant periods and swelling paragraphs. "*Knowledge and wisdom*," says the poet Cowper, "*far from being one, have oftentimes no connexion.*" There is no simplicity of diction; every thing is forced, conceited, and turgid. Instances of these faults need not be selected, they abound in every page, nor is Mr. Maurice's last work free from them. The most true and common ideas are couched in the most unnatural language. Thus, when Mr. Maurice would tell us, that he thought some plates were necessary to illustrate his descriptions, we are informed: "*While I daily advanced more deeply into the Ocean of Hindoo Mythology and Sciences; subject's so uncommon, and indeed, in some instances so improbable, successively pressed for discussion, that the force of language could not fully elucidate them; nor the most solemn attestations of the most authentic travellers, give them the stamp of credibility.*" I was therefore, to illustrate the ideas I wished to convey, compelled to have recourse to the power of another

science, and Engraving came in aid of her sister Mythology." Pref. p. 86. The intolerable bombast in the 101st page of the Preface; the description of the Mithraic worship in the second volume, which is full of the most absurd and inflated language; with a passage in the seventh where, for the word water, we meet in a common sentence, the synonym of "the aquatic element," are some of the most distressing specimens of the bad taste, and perversion of language which characterise the productions of this otherwise admirable author.

But this error is not the only one which has prevented the more universal reception of these laborious works. * Mr. Maurice by some strange fatality introduces himself, his exertions, his expenses, and private history on every possible opportunity. The extent to which this harmless, yet offensive, because obtrusive, egotism is carried, is scarcely credible to those who have not the good fortune to be acquainted with his volumes. At an early age Mr. Maurice published some poetry which did not become popular. In the 61st page of the Preface to his *Indian Antiquities*, he consoles himself under the neglect he experienced, by recalling, as every juvenile author is proud to do, the praises which had been bestowed on him in private by some eminent scholars, to whom the verses had been submitted. Mr. Maurice actually applies the following language to his own works. "Amidst continued and universal neglect, it is still matter of honest triumph, that the few detached pieces, &c. have received the warmest tribute of applause from men who would equally disdain to flatter or deceive; from men upon whose sterling judgment, and upon whose unadulterated taste I dare to rely; from men who know and feel the difference that subsists, between the nerveless singsong effusions of the day; and that sublime, energetic, manly poetry, that strikes with the force of electric fire, and seizes upon the captive heart." He then proceeds to add, that his love of poetry has corrupted his prose. It is unpleasant to observe the weaknesses of men to whom the common cause of literature is so much indebted, but it is this strange and uninvited egotism which runs through the whole book; it is this inflated language, which prevents the possibility of its popularity.

It may excite surprise thus to detail the faults of an author for whom I profess the greatest respect, and to whom is attributed such acknowledged merit. But there is no inconsistency in so doing. In relating what I truly believe to be the real cause of the apparent inattention with which the works of Mr. Maurice have been received, a most important lesson is presented to all authors. Learning, genius, and perseverance are of no avail, unless they are disciplined by good sense. If an author is not, after many exertions, well received by a public which can be neither deceived, nor bribed; which is too sensible, and too impartial, to decide wrong for years together; and which is ever pleased with the ambition and activity

of all, who appeal to its protection; let that author suspect himself, and rigidly examine into the probable causes of his failure. A high opinion of his own merits, and a compassion for the ignorance or bad taste of the age; though they may afford consolation, will yield no improvement. The fault is almost uniformly in themselves: and the spirit of labor which has enabled them to do so much, will always conquer the most inveterate faults. When Demosthenes was hissed from the stage, he did not declaim against the people. He discovered his faults, and avoided them. Above all, let the man who would hope to be a favored author carefully abstain from all self adulation, and obtrusive egotism. His readers know that books cannot be written, nor knowledge acquired without much patient thought, much laborious study, much anxiety and self-denial; they give the writer their approbation; but if he pays himself beforehand by relating in every page the privations and difficulties which must necessarily be undergone; they will withhold from the most meritorious his just tribute of applause. An author, who thus distracts the attention of the reader from his book to himself, is like a painter who exhibits a picture to the public. The spectators admire the splendor, or taste, or coloring, or other merit in the picture; they represent to their imagination the labor, anxiety, and desert of the artist; and would retire delighted with the picture, and interested in the fortunes of its painter. But, if instead of permitting them to examine the canvas undisturbed, its meritorious but ill-judging author were to place himself before it, were to persist in pointing out, what he considered its chief excellences; and proceed to relate his domestic sufferings, his assiduity, and skill, the most enthusiastic lover of the arts would be offended, and would relieve himself from the fatigue of listening to the painter by silently and totally neglecting the picture. T.

REMARKS

On a Criticism on MR. BELLAMY'S New Translation of the Bible from the original Hebrew.

AN article having appeared in a review on some passages in the New Translation of the Bible from the original Hebrew, I will offer a few remarks on some of its assertions, which do not appear to me conformable to the genius of the Hebrew language.

The writer of the article says, "The palpable absurdity of supposing that all the learned men of the present day, and of some centuries past, had been so enormously mistaken, and on

such important points, till Mr. Bellamy arose, and was able to set right every error, (without apparently feeling the least doubt of his own correctness) appeared too gross for any ignorance to swallow."

I do not think these remarks sanctioned by experience. There was a time when the world believed that the earth, and not the sun, was in the centre of our system, and this was believed even to the very late period of the world, the eighteenth century, when the great Newton ventured to oppose the "consecrated error." What was the treatment of that man, who has immortalised his nation by discovering to the world that knowledge which had been buried in oblivion for 5000 years? When he first broached what was then called by the bigots "*an infidel dogma, opposing the sacred scripture*," he was persecuted by them. And Galileo was brought before the tribunal of a horde of ignorant fanatics, and had his choice to deny his own words, that *the sun, and not the earth, was in the centre of our system, or to end his days in the dungeon of the inquisition.*"

The Critic then proceeds to point out what he conceives to be an inaccurate translation of Gen. vi. 14. *And thou shalt pitch it within and without with pitch.* He says, "The whole tenor of Mr. B.'s labors precludes any hope of his proving accessible to the argumentum ad verecundiam. We shall therefore treat the question as still disputable; and go on to shew that the meaning which he declares to be the radical, or primary sense of the word, is perfectly incompatible with the known and undisputed meaning of all its derivatives except one, or two at the most."

The Critic has here committed an error. The radical meaning, which Mr. Bellamy says is given by the sacred writer to the word כֹּפֶר *kopher*, is *atonement, ransom, satisfaction.* He says, "That this is the true meaning of the word כֹּפֶר *kopher*, and that it cannot possibly have any other, is confirmed in every other part of Scripture where it occurs." See where the same word, that is, with the same *consonants* and *vowels*, is so translated even in the common version; Exod. xxx. 12; Job xxxiii. 24; Prov. vi. 35; Isa. xliii. 3; Numb. xxxv. 31, 32. This being the radical meaning of the word, so used, and constantly applied by the sacred writers, I have accordingly translated it as it is understood and applied in other parts of Scripture. This not only relieves us from the incongruous expression, *pitch it with pitch*, but we are informed that the dispensation given to Adam after the fall, and continued in all the churches to the time of Noah, was preserved by him in the ark, where sacrifices were

offered during the time that the deluge was upon the earth, and the divine communication was given, as in the churches before the flood, from the mercy-seat between the cherubim; which communication was never given, *but when the sacrifice for atonement was upon the altar as representative of the Messiah.* And therefore the word כֹּפֶר *kopher*, atonement, expiation, ransom, satisfaction, or redemption, can have no other meaning in this verse, than it has in every other part of Scripture. It evidently refers to the Messiah, the great High Priest of this last dispensation, who is passed into the heaven of heavens: who is said to be *the propitiation for our sins*, 1 John ii. 4.—*Who hath put away sin by the sacrifice of himself*, Heb. ix. 26. *Who also maketh intercession for us*, Rom. [viii.] 34, before the seat of eternal mercy, of which the earthly mercy-seat was only a figure. Surely if this were the meaning of the word כֹּפֶר *kopher*, then we must render Exod. xxx. 12, *thou shalt give every man PITCH (ransom) for his soul*—Numb. xxxv. 31, *ye shall take NO PITCH (satisfaction) for the life of a murderer*—Job xxxiii. 2, *I have found PITCH (a ransom)*—Prov. vi. 35, *he will not regard any PITCH (ransom)*—Isa. xliii. 3, *I gave Egypt for thy PITCH (ransom).*

The Critic thinks that the word כֹּפֶר *kopher* means, "asphaltus, bitumen, or pitch; used to smear over wood or other things." The unprejudiced reader will acknowledge that Mr. B. has offered the most convincing reason for his translation of this important passage; *the declaration of the Scripture itself.* He says, "The word כֹּפֶר *kopher*, which the translators have rendered *pitch*, has no such meaning in any part of Scripture; and excepting this solitary verse, it is not translated by *pitch* in any part of the Bible. The word which is always used, and which is the proper word for *pitch*, is זֶפֶת *zepheth*. See Isa. xxxiv. 9, *And the streams thereof shall be turned into pitch*—Exod. ii. 3. *And daubed it with slime and with pitch.* Now as זֶפֶת *zepheth* is the only word in the whole Bible that is used for pitch, and as the word כֹּפֶר *kopher*, uniformly throughout the Scripture means *atonement*, or *redemption*, the reader who is in search of the truth, will probably admit that there is the best of all proof, the *Scripture*, for Mr. Bellamy's Translation.

The writer of the article does not appear to be intimately acquainted with the genius of the Hebrew language. He tells

us that כֶּפֶר *kephor* means a *hoar-frost*; and because a hoar frost covers, that כֹּפֶר *kopher*, which is a different word, must signify *pitch*, because pitch covers that to which it is applied. No attention has been paid by him to the orthography of the language. These two words differ as much as the words *poor* and *pare*; but it would be absurd to say that *pare* might mean *poor*, because the property of a person had been *cut off*, *pared*, or *impaired*. "The same word," continues he, "is also used for a small village; a covert, retired place in the country." This is really the case as we have it in 1 Sam. vi. 8. but the translation of this passage has been much disputed by the learned. Most assuredly וְעַד כֶּפֶר הַפָּרָזִי *vegnad kopher laphraazi*, cannot be translated, *and of country villages*. If this writer had examined the Hebrew, he would have found that no such meaning can be given to the clause; for the word כֹּפֶר *kopher*, is not translated. He, and some other writers, seem to suppose that the word when written with different vowels, always has the same meaning; whereas the same consonants with a change of vowel, always vary the mode of expression, as well as application.

The Critic says, that the atonement does not obliterate the sin; and he refers to Isa. xxviii. 18, "*your covenant with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell shall not stand*; literally, your covenant shall be *completely smeared over*, i. e. so as to become illegible. Had the verb been rendered *obliterated*, the original metaphor would have been preserved." This does not agree with the apostle, who says, *If we confess our sins He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness*: not to "*completely smear it over*." The Critic is obliged to assent to the scriptural proof given by Mr. Bellamy. He says, "In every other case, where the verb is found in these intensive voices, it has a reference to sins or offences, and is very properly rendered by the words connected with those ideas, which Mr. B. has assigned to the primary meaning." "Thus in Exod. xxxii. 20. we have no objection to Mr. B.'s translating it—*ye have committed a great sin; therefore now I will ascend before Jehovah, perhaps I shall atone for your sin*. Yet even here," says the Critic, "an adherence to the original idea would have made no confusion; and perhaps I shall completely cover, or obliterate your offence." But this would not be in agreement with the original. Mr. B. would call it a comment; for to *completely cover over* any thing,

plainly means that the thing *covered* still remains : the language also is improper, for to *cover*, is to "cover completely." The writer has given a new sense to the word *disannulled*, which he says, is to *smear over, illegible*. But the word means to make *null*, to make *void*. And the word *null* is to *annihilate*—the state of being *no where, non-existence*. Johnson.

The word כִּפָּר *kuphar*, which is in this verse of Isaiah rendered *disannulled*, is in Exod. xix. 33. properly rendered *atonement*; viz. *those things wherewith the atonement was made*; not *those things which were smeared over*. The Critic is here guilty of a perversion of the plain sense of this word, which is the same, both consonants and vowels, and can be rendered by no other word than *atonement*.

I cannot allow any force to the arguments which have been advanced against Mr. B.'s translation of this passage. His proofs must be attended to, because they are the declarations of Scripture, and he has set his foot upon a rock from which he can never be moved, the *atonement, reconciliation, satisfaction, or redemption*, which was to be accomplished at the coming of the Messiah, and concerning which he has, to the satisfaction of the unprejudiced reader, proved this important passage to be most clearly descriptive of the truths of the gospel dispensation.

The Critic tells us what has been said before without proof, and which has been refuted, not only by Mr. Bellamy, but by all able Hebrew scholars who have written on the subject, that the translators translated from the Hebrew. The Critic says, "Mr. B.'s assertions, that 'translations only were resorted to, and that no appeal was made to the Hebrew,' are in direct opposition to the plain fact before us. What can be said of a person who thus makes assertions, which the very passage on which he is at the time commenting proves to be false?" Mr. B. has not said that the translators had not the Hebrew before them as well as translations, and therefore that in many instances they might translate from Hebrew; but he has properly said that "no translation has been made from the Hebrew ONLY, since the 128th year of Christ." And the English translators themselves confirm it, as has been recently proved in the most satisfactory manner by Sir James Burges, in a publication intitled, *Reasons for a New Translation of the Scripture*. And therefore, disclaiming all improper personality, I may, according to the fair rules of criticism, ask in the words of the Critic, "What can be said of a person who thus makes assertions which the express words of the translators prove to be false?" If the writer fairly examined the original,

he would be sensible, by comparing the authorised version with the Hebrew, that the translators were correct when they said in their preface, that it was not their design to make a *new translation*, "but out of many good ones to make one principal good one." Surely the writer will not again assert, that, if the translators out of many translations attempted to make a good one, they translated or attempted to make a good one from the Hebrew ONLY. If he had read the ANTI-DEIST, lately published in refutation of the blasphemous publication called the DEIST, he would be inclined to form a more candid estimate of the author, and be convinced that the translators did not translate from the Hebrew. I would also recommend to his perusal, the *Critical Examination and Refutation of the Objections made by Mr. Whittaker to Mr. Bellamy's New Translation*; and he would perhaps find sufficient ground for changing the tone of his next article. At least I think he will refrain from persecuting the man whose sole design is to defend the sacred volume against the attacks of the enemies of divine revelation, and against those who declare that the sacred original "the inspired volume, is corrupt." I conceive that a more dangerous dogma cannot be promulgated, for if it were believed, there would be no dependence on the Bible; its genuineness and authenticity would vanish at once, and using Mr. B.'s words, "deism would bury in oblivion the truths of the gospel, as those great truths overwhelmed the Pagan religion at the time of Constantine the Great."

S. T.

* * * *We shall not refuse to admit articles on either side of this question, provided their length is confined to our limits, and their spirit critical, not personal; argumentative, not contumelious: τὰ σκληρὰ γὰρ τοι, καὶν ὑπέρδικ' ἤ, δάκνεις.* ED.

ILLUSTRATION OF JONAH, ii. 2.

THE difficulty in this verse, arising from our vulgar translation of it, is occasioned partly by a misconception of the original phrase **בְּטֶן שָׁחַל**, and partly by a ridiculous fable of the Rabbins, founded on this passage. **בְּטֶן** here signifies *locus medius intimus*, and the sentence may be rendered: 'I cried from the midst of the grave;' or in other words, *from the most intimate peril, and expectation of death*. In reviewing the numerous miraculous occurrences recorded in the Old Testament, from which the Hebrew poets borrowed the principal part of their finest images, we find the overthrow of Pharaoh in the red sea, to be one of the most majestic, and most capable of exciting sentiments of astonishment and terror. Accordingly, in the writings of the subsequent authors, we frequently discover metaphors derived from this source, and applied as fear, sorrow, or entreaty, most prevailed. The sea may be naturally considered as a grave, and by an easy transition, its floods, billows, &c. were used to express the attendant or imminent dangers of the tomb. It is in this light we must explain many verses of the Psalms. Thus, Ps. xlii. 7. lxix. 1, 2. cxxiv. 4, 5, are only meant to betoken the fear of David at the approach of death, and to give a lively and sensible idea of a man struggling for life in the abyss of waters, the unfathomable deep. In Ps. lxxxviii. 6, the figure is more clearly shown, and will throw light on the present remarks.

שְׁתַּנִּי בְּכּוֹר תַּחְתִּיּוֹת
בְּמַחְשָׁכִים בְּמַצְלוֹת:

'Thou hast placed me in the lowest pit; (thou hast placed me) in darkness in the deeps.' Here, by a parallel, one part of the text is analogous to the other, and consequently both mean the same thing. In the same Psalm, v. 7. 'Thou hast afflicted me with all thy waves,' and v. 3. 'my life draweth nigh unto the grave,' imply precisely the same meaning. Job, in a similar manner, but with more reality, exclaims: 'For thou hast cast me into the deep, in the midst of the seas (**בְּלִבְיָם**) and the floods compassed me about: all thy billows and thy waves passed over me. The waters compassed me about, even to the life, (ad periculum vitæ) the depth closed me round about: weeds were wrapped about my head;' c. ii. 9. 5. The next

verse is descriptive of the Jewish sepulchre, but as usual, highly figurative, and we recognise in it epithets found in many other parts of the Scripture.

לקצבי הרים ירדתי
הארץ ברחיח בעדי לעולם
: ותעל משחת ה' יהוה אלהי :

'I went down to the bottoms of the mountains ; the earth with its bars *was* about me for ever : yet thou hast raised up my life from corruption, O Jehovah ! my God.'

The ancients in their poetical representations of Hades, testify somewhat similar ideas. In Hesiod we read, ἐπ' ἑσχατιῇ, μεγάλῃς ἐν πείρασιν Γαίης, and πελώρης ἑσχατὰ γαίης : and the *sub gurgite vasto*, and *tristi compescit unda*, of Virgil and Horace are well known. But the best comment on the Hebrew quotations, and which points out their genuine signification, is the following epigram from the Anthologia :

Ναυηγοῦ τάφος εἰμί· ὁ δ' ἀντίον ἔστι γεωργοῦ.

Ὡς ἀλλ' καὶ γαίῃ ξυγὸς ὕπест' Αἴδης.

'*Naufragus hic jaceo ; contra, jacet ecce colonus !*

Idem Orcus terræ, sic, pelagoque subest.'

Ex version. S. Johnson.

If this is favorably received, I may be tempted to send an essay on the precise extent and meaning of the word מֵלֶכֶת, and the knowledge of a future state of punishment among the Jews.

MUSSIDIUS.

Portsmouth,
June, 1820.

ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΟΥ ΜΗΔΕΙΑ. EURIPIDIS MEDEA.

In usum studiosæ Juventutis recensuit et illustravit

PETRUS ELMSLEY, A. M. Oxoniî, 1818. 8vo.

No. II. [Continued from No. XXXVIII, p. 289.]

Quid universe de opera, quam P. Elmslcus Medæ præstitit, sentiremus, in prima parte censuræ nostræ diximus. Pergamus nunc reliqua deinceps persequi, de quibus aliquid nobis adno-

tandum videtur, non tamen ut omnia, præsertim adnotationes secundarias in imis paginis attingamus. Has enim si pertractare vellemus, liber nobis scribendus esset multo maior, quam Elmsleii liber est, quum plurimos ille in adnotationibus istis veterum scriptorum locos brevissime indicatis rationibus corrigere tentaverit, quarum correctionum cur plurimæ nobis non probentur, dicere longum est. Videtur autem Elmsleius corrigendi opportunitates nimia cum cupiditate quærere: id quod eum non dubitamus ipsum aliquando improbaturum esse. Est enim hæc communis sors eorum, qui arti criticæ operam dant, ut initio nihil non corruptum esse suspicentur, ubi autem maturuit scientia, paullatim intelligant, multo minus corruptos ad nos pervenisse veteres scriptores, quam a criticis esse corruptos.

In anapæstis, qui sunt a v. 95., quum libri fluctuent inter Doricas et communes formas, Doricas Elmsleius Medææ, communes nutrici restituit, Porsonumque dicit maiorem sibi in hoc genere licentiam sumpturum fuisse in Hippolyto, quam in Medea fecit. Veremur ne non satis idoneus in hac re auctor sit Porsonus, siquidem non potest dubitari, quin tragici etiam in eiusdem personæ verbis pro rei, de qua sermo est, natura, animique affectionis diversitate communes Doricasque formas coniunxerint. Quamquam his quidem in anapæstis non est, quod magnopere pugnare cum Elmsleio velimus.

V. 97. Non possumus quin adnotationem ex eo genere commemoremus, quales permultas in hoc libro inveniri in prima parte censuræ nostræ diximus, quæ cur scriptæ sint, plane intelligi non potest. "Ante Euripidem," inquit, "καρδία in anapæsto usurpat Æschylus Prom. 880. καρδία δὲ φόβῳ φρένα λακτίζει." Cur hoc, obsecro, dixit? An quemquam adeo ineptum esse putavit, ut καρδία dici posse in anapæstis credat? In iambis si καρδία posuisset Æschylus, dignum memoratu fuisset, quia hi καρδία potius postulant.

V. 102. Corrigit ἀγρίῳ τ' ἦθος, copulam sæpius in priore membro omitti ab librariis observans. Qua opportunitate utitur, ut locos nonnullos corrigat. Sed ut recte emendaverit Eurip. Androm. 424. et Suppl. 87. at in Æschyli Agam. 810. non erat idonea caussa, quare scribi vellet, κάρτ' ἀπομούσος τ' ἦσθα γεγραμμένος, οὐτ' εὖ πραπίδων οἶα κα νέμων, pro eo, quod legabatur, κάρτ' ἀπομούσως ἦσθα γεγραμμένος, οὐδ'. Aliquanto peius res cessit Blomfieldio, ἀπομούσων scribenti. Non magis probandum putamus, quod in Aristoph. Lys. 551. Elmsleius reponi

vult, ἀλλ' ἤνπερ ὁ τε γλυκύθυμος Ἔρως χή Κυπριόγενει Ἀφροδίτῃ. Facilius erat et aptius, ἀλλ' ἤνπερ γ'.

V. 105. Difficilis locus est : δῆλον δ' ἀρχῆς ἐξαιρόμενον νέφος οἰμωγῆς, ὡς τάχ' ἀνάψει μείζονι θυμῷ. Disserit vir doctissimus de scripturæ varietate, constructionemque fortasse dicit huiusmodi esse : δῆλον δ' ὡς τάχ' ἀνάψει μείζονι θυμῷ (ἡ Μήδεια) νέφος οἰμωγῆς ἀρχῆς ἐξαιρόμενον. Intelligi hic potest, quid differant constructionis explicatio, in qua Elmsleius, ut alii eius populares, multam operam collocavit, et explanatio sententiæ. Constructionem enim explicuit : sed quid iuvat, construi posse orationem ad leges grammaticas, si, quem sensum habeat, et an is aptus sit, non ostenditur? Atqui quid est ἀρχῆς ἐξαιρόμενον? Porsonus id per anastrophē dictum accipit pro ἐξ ἀρχῆς αἰρόμενον, eumque sequi videtur Elmsleius. At iterum quærimus, quid hoc sit. Nam si ἐξ ἀρχῆς est *ab initio*, negamus admitti posse anastrophē, quæ, ubi præpositio cum nomine suo vim habet adverbii, nullo modo locum inveniet, ut appareat, alienum esse, quod Porsonus affert, σώματα ἦβην εἰσῆλθε, pro σώματα εἰς ἦβην ἦλθε. In cuiusmodi exemplis recte se habet anastrophe, quia singula verba suam propriam vim et potestatem retinent. At quod est, ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἰς τέλος βαίνειν, *ab initio usque ad finem ire*, i. e. *perpetuo ire*, neque ἀρχῆς ἐκβαίνειν, neque τέλος εἰσβαίνειν dici potest. Itaque si anastrophe hic usus esset Euripides, propriè singula verba accipienda forent, nubesque diceretur sublata ex suo initio, quod dici absurdum esset, quia nihil est, quod non nascatur ex suo initio. Apertum vero, hoc dici debuisse, ex initio, quod fecisset Medea, cognosci, multo eam graviora nubila concitaturam esse. Quare sic distinguendum putamus, δῆλον δ' ἀρχῆς, ἐξαιρόμενον νέφος οἰμωγῆς ὡς τάχ' ἀνάψει μείζονι θυμῷ. Insolentius quidem dictum, δῆλον ἀρχῆς, sed tamen ut recte dictum videatur. Et habet hanc interpretationem scholiastes, neque alio spectat ἐξ, quod libri quidam ante ἀρχῆς inserunt. Hæc explicatio si cui displicebit, ei non video quid reliquum sit, quam ut νέφος ἀρχῆς οἰμωγῆς coniungat, *nubem initii gemituum*, quod neque elegans, neque satis aptum est. Cæterum etiam de ἀνάψει paullo accuratius quæri potuerat. Nam sic si legitur, idquæ verbum de Medea accipitur, facilius quis δῆλῃ, quam δῆλον expectet. Quod nomen quum arguere videatur, verbum illud ad νέφος spectare, melior videtur altera lectio, ἀνάξει : sic enim pro ἀνάξει scribendum, recte monuit Elmsleius. Atque optime congruunt ἐξαιρόμενον et ἀνάξει.

V. 115. Miramur, quod Elmsleius, quum Porsonus edidisset,

τὶ δὲ σοὶ παῖδες πατρὸς ἀμπλακίας μετέχουσιν, vulgatam τὶ δὲ σοὶ paullo meliorem, saltem non deteriorem videri dicit. Ne multo quidem meliorem, sed unice veram dici oportebat, siquidem quod Porsonus dedit, plane frigidum et omnino non aptum est.

V. 118. Bene quidem monet vir doctissimus, non satis apte hic philosophari nutricem, sed quod ait, nihil cum Medæ conditione commune habere, quæ de regum animo dicantur, ipse potuerat ex parte saltem explicare, si in versu 117. recte functus esset officio interpretis. Ad eum versum nihil adnotavit, servans interpunctiones Porsoni, οἱμοι, τέκνα, μή τι πάθῃθ' ὥς ὑπεραλγῶ. Ut videatur construi voluisse, ὥς ὑπεραλγῶ, μή τι πάθῃτε. At non modo dubitari potest, an ea verba sic potius interpungenda sint, μή τι πάθῃθ' ὥς ὑπεραλγῶ. sed suadere id etiam planior verborum ordo videtur. Quin tertia supererat via, eaque ipsa est, quam ingrediendam fuisse existimamus, ut melius cohæreret nutricis digressio de regibus: οἱμοι, τέκνα, μή τι, πάθῃθ' ὥς ὑπεραλγῶ δεινὰ τυράννων λήματα.

V. 121. Probamus, quod Elmsleius vulgatam, τὸ γὰρ εἰθίσθαι, restituit. Sed vellemus, vir doctissimus, qui alias leviora et quæ vix cuiquam prosint adnotare solet, hac opportunitate ostendisset, cur, quod Porsonus ex Brunckii coniectura posuerat, τὸ δ' ἄρ' εἰθίσθαι, hic quidem ferri posset, aliis autem in non paucis tragicorum locis, in quibus δ' ἄρ' pro γὰρ reponi voluerunt critici, non esset admittendum.

V. 126. Valde miramur virum doctissimum, qui non acquiescens in ea interpretatione, quam nos dederamus, verba τὰ δ' ὑπερβάλλοντ' οὐδένα καιρὸν δύναται sic explicanda putet, ut δύναται sit ἰσχύει, σθένει, quæ nostra quoque sententia erat, οὐδένα καιρὸν autem significet, οὐκ εἰς καιρὸν, ἀκαίρως, idque hic non sit *intempestive*, sed *immoderate, supra modum*. Unde sensum esse vult: *plus æquo valent mortalibus, i. e. potentiores quam expedit, reddunt homines, ad tempus scilicet*. Pergere enim poetam, μείζους δ' ἅτας ὅταν ὀργισθῇ δαίμων, οἴκοις ἀπέδωκεν. Vix putamus infeliciorum horum verborum interpretationem excogitari posse. Nam ne οὐδένα καιρὸν pro ἀκαίρως dictum urgeamus, quid τὰ ὑπερβάλλοντα; quum mediocritatem laudet, aliud sunt quam *immodica*? Quod si etiam οὐδένα καιρὸν est *supra modum*, quid aliud dicetur, quam, *immodica supra modum valida sunt*? Illud præterea, quod sibi invenire vir doctissimus in his verbis videtur, iusto potentiores reddi homines ad tempus, ipse viderit, quomodo elicuerit. Accedit, quod, si posset hæc in his verbis esse sententia, tamen inepta foret hoc loco, in quo planum est, ita et procedere et debere procedere sententias: *optima est mediocri-*

tas: quod autem modum excedit, nihil tempestivum efficit mortalibus, maioraque, quum Deus irascitur, affert mala. Cæterum *καιρόν* pro *καιρία* dixit Pindarus Pyth. i. 157. Neque aliena sunt apud eundem *πολλῶν καιρῶς* Nem. i. 28. et *καιρῶς ὀλβον* vii. 86. pro *πολλὰ καιρία* et *ὀλβος καιρίως*.

V. 131. Numerorum, ut videtur, insolentia offensus Elmsleius post *Κολχίδος* aliquid excidisse suspicatur, fortasse *οἰκτρὰν* vel *αὐδάν*. At utrumque valde friget. Jure videmur postulari posse ut, qui tragicum edat, eum habeat numerorum usum, ut, præsertim in tam facili loco, quæ metra usurpata sint animadvertat. Et vidit quidem hic aliquid huius rei Elmsleius, quum v. 134. *γόνον* pro *βοάν* scribendum coniecit, et v. 135. *ὦ γύναι* scripsit: sed quos dedit v. 131—135. numeros, ut verum dicamus, partim insolentes et pravi, partim elumbes sunt. Ita describi verba debebant:

τᾷς δυστάνου

Κολχίδος, οὐδέ πω ἦπιος· ἀλλὰ γεραία.

Inde sequi debebat hexameter dactylicus acatalectus, et pentameter acatalectus.

V. 136. Dedit Elmsleius, *ἐπεὶ μοι φιλία κέκρανται*, comparans *ἔριν κραίγειν* in Androm. 478. Videtur eum hæc phrasium comparatio movisse, ut hanc scripturam, quam unus codex a Puteano collatus præbet, in textum admitteret. At quid ad rem, si similis phrasis alibi invenitur? Plerique libri *φίλον*, quod vel propter hanc caussam, et magis etiam propter sensum recipi debebat. *Κέκρανται* nihil est quam *effectum est*. Et ita legit etiam scholiastes.

V. 137. 138. Bene ostendit Elmsleius, Porsonum errasse in emendando hoc loco. Ipse *καὶ δὴ γὰρ ἔχει* coniicit, has particulas ita positas inveniri observans v. 1076., quam coniecturam dignam quidem commemoratu, sed non in textu ponendam dicit, in quo Musgravii emendationem posuit, *τὸν μὲν γὰρ ἔχει*, pro *ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἔχει*, quod libri habent. Verissime Musgravius. Nam et veteres librarii, et nemo non sæpe in scribendo quæ eodem redeunt, maximeque quæ inverti possunt, permutant. Suam vero coniecturam Elmsleius neque commemorare et profecto ne facere quidem debebat. Quid enim ad hunc locum, quod istæ particulæ alio in loco leguntur? Hic non sunt aptæ, neque alterutra sola posita, neque ambæ coniunctæ. Idque non vidisse virum doctissimum tanto magis mirum est, quod ipse, quæ vis sit particularum *καὶ δὴ*, ad v. 380. docet.

V. 147. "Si certum esset," inquit, "*ἰαχὰν* mediam apud Atticos semper producere, facile reponi posset *ἀχάγ*." Optamus,

ut numquam obliviscatur vir præstantissimus, quod ipse sapienter dixit in subiecta adnotatione: " si unum tantum de his quinque exemplis exstaret, quis vulgatam scripturam defendere auderet?" Itaque etiam atque etiam rogamus, procul habeat istud ἀχάν, quod in Æschyli quidem S. ad Th. 921. recte restituit, versum illum ingeniosa, sed minime tamen probabili coniectura tentatis: δόμων μάλ' ἀχάν ἐς οὐς προπίμπει. Quid enim prodest coniectura quamvis elegans, si ab sensu loci aliena est, ut omittam, quod simul etiam antistrophicus versus emendandus erat, quem attingit quidem vir doctissimus p. 147. sed ut non afferat medelam. De sensu autem quod dicebamus, quem criticus ante omnia debet respicere, quid aliud nobis dedit Elmsleius quam huiusmodi sententiam: ædium luctum meus luctus mihi ad aurem admovet?

V. 149. Scribendum coniicit, τίς σοί ποτε τᾷς ἀπλάτου κοίτας ἔρος, eo sensu, quo v. 423. τᾷς ἀνάνδρου κοίτας. Nam πελάζειν, πλάθειν, πλησιάζειν de coniugio usurpari, quod aliquot exemplis demonstrat. Non diffitemur, hanc quoque ingeniosam esse coniecturam: sed istorum, quibus utitur, verborum exempla nihil ad rem faciunt. Illud erat demonstrandum, etiam ἀπλάτος ita dici, quod veremur ne demonstrari nequeat. Ita enim huic nomini videtur rei gravis et metuendæ significatio adhæsisse, ut valde dubium sit, an non recte de eo, quod simplicitate vetitum et prohibitum est, dicatur. Cæterum, ut solet vir doctissimus ubique occasionem corrigendi quærere, parum circumspecte quum de aliis locis iudicat, tum de Rhesi v. 310. in quo Pier-sonum ad Moer. p. 25. recte ἀπλάτον scribere ait. At male Pier-sonus, cuius disputatio de verbis ἀπλετος, ἀπληστος, ἀπλητος omnino parum explicata est. Unice ἀπληστος illi loco convenit, idque libri etiam in Medæ versu recte, ut nobis videtur, præbent.

V. 156. Bene disputat de forma verbi εὐνέταν, sed quod ait, in hoc metri genere epitritum primum et diiambum bene sibi respondere, etsi per se verum est, tamen quæ exempla affert, non quadrant: sunt enim ex aliis metris deprompta, et alterum quidem etiam corruptum. Quo numero esse putet versum, quem dedit,

μη λῖαν τάκου δυρομένα σὸν εὐνέταν,

non potest ex iis, quæ dicit, intelligi. Accuratioꝝ observatio usitata præbisset metra, in quibus Cretici ac Molossi permutatio offensione caret:

Ζεὺς σοί τὸδε συνδικήσει' μη λῖαν
τάκου δυρομένα σὸν εὐνέταν.

V. 162. Si interpretis officio fungi, ut promiserat, volebat Elmsleius, malleus omisisset longam adnotationem ad v. 160. qua usitatissimam et nemini non notissimam formulam αὐτοῖς μελάθροις διακναιομένους multis exemplis confirmat, et potius, cur in his, οἷ γέ με πρόσθεν·τολμᾶσ' ἀδικεῖν, additum sit πρόσθεν, docuisset. Hoc enim eiusmodi est, ut, quum facile possit inutiliter adiectum videri, aliqua adnotatione indigeat. Paucis indicabimus, monendum fuisse, dici ita propter prægressum ὅρκους ἐνδησαμένα, siquidem Græci, ubi de pacto et fœdere sermo est, illud maxime urgere solent, si quis prior fidem solverit, quo facto alter, si idem facit, iure agere videtur. Sic iam Homerus :

ὁπότεροι πρότεροι ὑπὲρ ὀρκία πημήνειαν.

V. 179. Scribendum putamus, σπεῦσον δέ τι πρὶν κακῶσαι, ut cod. Rom. D. habet, nisi quod cum cæteris libris δὲ omittit. Τί in his non cum σπεῦσον, sed cum κακῶσαι iungendum. Similes encliticarum collocationes indicavimus ad Vigerum p. 893. seq.

V. 210. In verbis, οἶδα γὰρ πολλοὺς βροτῶν σεμνοὺς γεγῶτας, τοὺς μὲν ὀμμάτων ἄπο, τοὺς δ' ἐν θυραίοις, iuxta ac reliqui interpretes dubius hæret Elmsleius. Verum vidit Seidlerus sensum esse : *novi, multos homines austeros, alios quos ipse oculis meis vidi, alios de quibus audiui*. Comparat ille Æschyli Agam. 997. πύθομαι δ' ἀπ' ὀμμάτων νόστον, αὐτόμαρτυς ᾦν, et Soph. Œd. Col. 14. πύργοι μὲν οἱ πόλιν στέγουσιν, ὥς ἀπ' ὀμμάτων, πρόσω : i. e. *ut ad aspectu cognoscitur*.

V. 215. Laudamus diligentiam, qua de constructione voculæ πρὶν disseruit Elmsleius, licet non in omnibus ei assentiamur. Statim quod ait, “subiunctivum non usurpant tragici, nisi in priore membro adsit negandi aut prohibendi significatio,” ita dictum est, ut lectores credere debeant, qui ita loquatur, aut a cæteris scriptoribus non esse observatam hanc regulam dicere, aut se præter tragicos nihil legisse significare. Atqui non proprium hoc tragicorum est, sed commune omnium, qui Græce scripserunt. Paullo aptius πρὶν sine ᾦν cum subiunctivo tragicis, sive rectius omnibus poëtis, qui non familiarem sermonem imitantur, tribuisset. Et abiudicat sane hanc omissionem particulæ ᾦν cum Porsonæ a familiari sermone : iure an iniuria alibi quæremus. Nunc si Græci omnes a coniunctivo cum πρὶν coniungendo abstinere, nisi negatio sit in altero membro, operæ pretium fecisset vir doctissimus, ut nobis videtur, si huius rei causam aperuisset. Permirus enim videatur necesse est, οὐ ποιήσω πρὶν ᾦν κελεύσης recte dici, male autem ποιήσω πρὶν :

ἀν κελεύσης, quum præsertim neque Latina, neque aliæ linguæ huiusmodi discrimen norint. Verumtamen si omnes Græci illud discrimen observarunt, quid aliud, quam caussam aliquam subesse censebimus, cur necessario ita loqui debuerint? Aliter enim ne millena quidem exempla vincent, ut non potuisse etiam discedi ab illa consuetudine credamus. Videmus vero. Recte dicitur et ποιήσω et οὐ ποιήσω, πρὶν σε κελεύσαι. Quid ita? Quia hoc idem est, ac πρὸ τοῦ κελεύσαι σε. Atqui quæ præcedunt mandatum, sive fiant, sive non fiant, certum est et planum quo tempore fiant vel non fiant: fiunt enim aut non fiunt ante mandatum. Longe aliud est πρὶν ἀν κελεύσης. Quod qui dicit, non solum illud, *ante mandatum*, dicit, sed primo subindicat, incertum esse, utrum tu sis mandaturus, an non; deinde autem, quoniam apud Græcos in omni coniunctivo significatio quædam futuri exacti est, mandatum illud etiam ut iam datum commemorat, hoc modo, *prius quam quo tempore tu mandaveris*, sive Græce, πρὶν ἢ ὅταν κελεύσης. Iam οὐ ποιήσω πρὶν ἢ ὅταν κελεύσης planum est, nihil aliud significare, quam ποιήσω ὅταν κελεύσης. Vide vero quid sit ποιήσω πρὶν ἢ ὅταν κελεύσης. Nihil profecto aliud, quam *faciam prius, quam quo tempore tu mandaveris, quod nescio an sis umquam mandaturus*. Atqui si facies quid quo tempore id, quod nescis futurumne sit an non, nondum factum erit, quando tandem facies? Certum enim esse debet non modo esse futurum, sed etiam quando futurum sit, si ante, quam fiat, facere quid vis. Quare nisi infinitivo uti voles, dicere debebis aut ποιήσω πρὶν κελεύσεις, aut ποιήσω πρὶν ἀν κελεύσαις, i. e. *priusquam iubere poteris*. Sed ποιήσω πρὶν ἀν κελεύσης non magis Græce dicas, quam Latine, *facies priusquam iusserim*. Eadem enim in utroque perversitas est. Sed redeamus ad ea, quæ dixit Elmsleius. Ac laudamus, quod monuit, non illud spectandum esse, utrum ipsa particula οὐ vel μὴ in altero membro sit, sed utrum sententia sit negativa, an non. Nam etiam in affirmativa sententia particulam negativam usurpari, et negativam posse sententiam esse sine particula negativa. Sed erravit tamen in loco Orestis v. 1218.

- * φύλασσε δ', ἣν τις, πρὶν τελευτηθῇ φόνος,
ἢ ξύμμαχος τις, ἢ κασίγνητος πατρὸς
ἐλθὼν ἐς οἴκους φθῇ.

Neque enim in verbis φύλασσε δ' ἣν τις, quæ idem sint ac φύλασσε μὴ τις, quærenda negatio est, sed adest in ipso verbo φθῇ, de quo verbo dictum ad Vigerum adnot. 320. Simonides fr. 231. apud Stobæum Serm. xcvi. (xcviii.)

φθάνει δὲ τὸν μὲν γῆρας ἄζηλον λαβὼν,
πρὶν τέρμ' ἵκηται.

Aliud huiusmodi exemplum ex Synesio adnotavit Devarius. Cæterum operæ pretium erat errorem eorum notare, qui in Sophoclis Antig. 618. interpunxerunt, εἰδότες δ' οὐδὲν, ἔρπει, πρὶν πυρὶ θερμῷ πόδα τις προσφάσῃ, siquidem et linguæ lex, de qua dictum, et sententia verborum οὐδὲν cum ἔρπει iungi postulat. Eleganter Seidlerus ita hunc locum emendat: εἰδότες δ' οὐδὲν ῥέπει, πρὶν πυρὶ θερμῷ πόδα τις προσφάσῃ, nihil mutans in strophicis, nisi quod ἀκάμαντοι scribit.

V. 218. Hic non abs re fuisset adnotare, in Cleonem hæc dicta esse, qui tum maxime civibus incommodabat.

V. 223. Recte putamus Elmsleium dixisse, scripturam γιγνώσκειν καλῶς a scholiasta tribui videri histrionibus. Apposuit autem verba scholiastæ, ut in ed. Ven. leguntur: Καθαίνει χρήζω.) τοῦτο ἐν ᾗ θει ἀναπεφώνηται. Κάκιστος ἀνδρῶν ἐν ᾗ ἦν μοι πάντα, κάκιστος ἀνδρῶν ἐκβέβηκεν· οἱ δ' ὑποκρίται οὐ συμπεριφερόμενοι τῷ τρόπῳ, λέγουσι γινώσκειν καλῶς. "Hæc," inquit, "acutioribus corrigenda relinquo." Cur obsecro corrigenda? nisi quod ita consuerit, corrigendo initium facere, quod fieri interpretando debet. Adeo plana sunt omnia, ut miremur profecto, quid corrigi velit. Nam illud quidem nemo non videt, κάκιστος ἀνδρῶν ante ἐν ᾗ poetæ verba esse, quibus suam deinde explicationem addit scholiastes. Iam quid ille? Καθαίνει χρήζω moribus convenienter dictum ait. Ferox enim Medea et animi impotens est. Quæ sequuntur, sic construenda significat, ἐν ᾗ ἦν μοι πάντα, κάκιστος ἐκβέβηκεν. Ex quo apertum est, cum non γιγνώσκειν καλῶς, sed aliter legisse. Quid legerit, non dicit: sed veri simile est, legisse eum γιγνώσκεις καλῶς. Histriones enim, non accommodantes se ingenio Medæ, γιγνώσκειν καλῶς pronunciare dicit. Hoc videlicet vult, Medeam, qua est animi affectionum vehementia, ea etiam in amore uti, ideoque dicere, *in quo mihi, ut bene scis, omnia sita erant*. Id fugisse histriones: unde eos aliter pronunciare et construere hæc verba. Quomodo vero? Res ipsa monstrat. Nam si γιγνώσκειν illi pronunciabant, πάντα cum hoc verbo, non cum ἦν debebant coniungere: ἐν ᾗ γὰρ ἦν μοι, πάντα γιγνώσκειν καλῶς, *in quo mihi situm erat, ut omnia recte instituerem*. Nam γιγνώσκειν est etiam *decernere, constituere*. Iphig. Aul. 107. ἂ δ' οὐ καλῶς ἔγνω τὸτ', αὐτὸς μεταγράφω καλῶς πάλιν. Iam vero alia oritur quæstio, verumne sit, quod de histrionibus refert scholiastes, an fictum. Ac magnopere vereor, ne, quod ille legisse videtur γιγνώσκεις καλῶς, emendatio sit critici cuiuspiam, convenire id ingenio Medæ, infinitivum autem ab histrionibus invectum rati. Quare nescio an Matthiæ etiam

laudandus sit, quod γιγνώσκειν revocaverit, quod optime cum iis, quæ ante dixerat Medea, congruit, ψυχὴν διέφθαρχα et κατανεῖν χρῆζω. Intelligit enim hæc choro videri debere μὴ καλῶς ἐγνώσμενα : unde addit, non mirum esse, si quid minus recte consulat : per quem enim sibi steterit, omnia recte facere, ab eo se desertam esse.

V. 224. Non perutilem quæstionem movisse nobis videtur Elmsleius de eo, utrum in quinta sede trimetri ἐμὸς an ὀμὸς præstet. In qua re iudicanda si vellet recto iudicio procedere, nonnisi eiusmodi exemplis uti debebat, in quibus pariter et ἐμὸς et ὀμὸς dici licebat. Nam quid mirum, ubi non poterat ὀμὸς dici, ἐμὸς; ubi non poterat ἐμὸς, ὀμὸς, dictum esse?

V. 256. Mirabar, quum legerem, πόσιν δίκην τῶνδ' ἀντιτίσασθαι κακῶν et similia me in Obs. crit. p. 64. nullo pacto cum Græcæ linguæ legibus conciliari posse contendisse, librumque inspexi. Et quamquam neque quæ olim adolescens scripsi, defendere, si falsa sint, velim, neque, si nunc me errare quis doceat, non libenter sententiam mutem, tamen non hoc, quod Elmsleius ait, ibi a me dictum est, sed illud, τοὺς κτανόντας ἀντικατακτανεῖν δίκην Græcæ linguæ legibus repugnare. Id vero nondam refutavit Elmsleius.

V. 257. Non satis circumspecte scripsisse eum putamus ἢ τ' ἐγῆματο pro ἦν τ' ἐγῆματο, quod et libri omnes et Eustathius tuentur. Non intercedam equidem, quominus quis Antiphanis auctoritatem eleve, quoniam non exstat locus, ut iudicare possimus; neque defendam grammaticum, qui diserte scribit de illo Antiphanis loco, ἐγῆμάμην ὁ ἀνὴρ λέγει ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐγῆμα. At illud non iniuria postulari poterit, ut, qui apud Euripidem ἢ τ' ἐγῆματο scribendum contendat, prius quærat, quid sit γῆμασθαι. Mirum enim, quum vir γῆμαι dicatur, mulierem non modo dici γαμηθῆναι, sed plerumque γῆμασθαι. Ex quo facile conicias, γῆμασθαι proprie esse, dare in matrimonium, se scilicet, vel suos, quemadmodum γαμέσασθαι est expetere puellam in matrimonium: ex quo γαμεθεῖσα, expetita, desponsata, fefellit interpretes Theocriti viii. 91. ut ostendimus in Diar. litt. Lips. 1817. m. Februar. n. 37. p. 294. Verum vidit nuper etiam Kiesslingius. Itaque apud Euripidem omnia sanæ sunt, ipsis poetæ verbis veram interpretationem monstrantibus: neque enim de Iasone, sed de Creonte verbum illud intelligi voluit, quum dixit, τὸν δόντα τ' αὐτῷ θυγατέρ', ἦν τ' ἐγῆματο, et qui dedit ei filiam, et quam dedit.

V. 274. Nihil Elmsleii adnotationes legenti tam molestum est, quam pruritus ille corrigendi, etiam ubi omnia integerrima

sunt. Exemplis vix ulla pagina caret. Sed hæc pleraque omnia intacta præterimus. Tantum hic illic aliquid ex hoc genere adnotabimus. Ad verba, *οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῆς εὐπρόσοιστος ἔκβασις*, scholiastes adscripsit: *εὐπρόσοιστος, εὐεπιβούλευτος, καὶ ῥαδίᾳ πρὸς τὸ διαφυγεῖν αὐτήν*. “Immo,” inquit, “πρὸς τὸ διαφυγεῖν αὐτήν. Quid vero pro *εὐεπιβούλευτος* legendum sit, non video.” Neque hoc mutandum, et pessime αὐτήν, quod nemo non ad αὐτήν referet, in hanc ipsam vocem mutavit, quam si posuisset scholiastes, scripsisset *τὴν αὐτήν*. Quid est autem, quod in *εὐεπιβούλευτος* reprehendat? Nam si *ἐπιβουλεύειν* proprie est *agitare aliquid animo, moliri*, quod constat non semper in malam partem dici, quidni etiam *εὐεπιβούλευτος* recte significabit id, quod quis facile mente concipiat atque aggredi conetur?

V. 291. Recte quidem ἄλλης servavit Elmsleius in verbis *χωρὶς γὰρ ἄλλης ἀργίας*, sed quo argumento utitur, sæpe abundare ἄλλος, uti minime debebat. Insani profecto fuissent Græci, si verba orationi inseruissent nihil significantia. Aptus hic locus erat longæ et non inutili dissertationi, quæ de nomine ἄλλος, quod nimis sæpe lusit interpretes, contexti poterat. Quem id usum habeat in his Medæ versibus,

*χωρὶς γὰρ ἄλλης ἧς ἔχουσιν ἀργίας
φθάνον πρὸς ἀστῶν ἀλφάνουσι δυσμενῇ,*

is sic explicandus est: *nam præter alia, nominatim ignaviam, etiam invidia laborant*. Satis putamus, hæc tribus verbis indicasse, qui non ipsi interpretationem, sed censuram interpretationis scribamus.

V. 310. Bene atque acute ostendit vir doctissimus, scripsisse Euripidem, *ἀλλ' εἴσω φρενῶν ὀρῶνδία μοι, μὴ τι βουλεύης κακόν*, non, ut legitur, *βουλεύσης*, quia non metuat Creon, ne aliquando Medea malum machinatura sit, sed ne id iam nunc faciat. Non ex omni parte tamen, quæ disputat, nobis satisfaciunt. “Legitur,” inquit, “apud Sophoclem Troch. 550. ταῦτ' οὖν φοβοῦμαι μὴ πόσις μὲν Ἡρακλῆς ἐμός καλῆται, τῆς νεωτέρας δ' ἀνὴρ. Ubi futurum tempus significari res ipsa declarat. Sic etiam Aristophanes Eccl. 865. *δίδοικα γὰρ μὴ καὶ παρὰ τῇ στρατηγίδι, ὅτ' ἂν κατατιθῶ, προσποιῇ τῶν χρημάτων*. Non sum nescius huiusmodi exempla nonnulla reperiri posse. Sed si centum millia exstarent, non defenderent scripturam quam nunc oppugno. Nam ex eo quod *γράφη* pro *γράφη* nonnunquam usurpatur, temerarius sit qui statuatur *γράφη* pro *γράφη* usurpari posse.” Laudamus quidem, quod exemplis se non moveri dicit: sed in re ipsa tamen nonnihil fallitur. Nam neque *γράφη* pro *γράφη* dicitur, neque omnino illa, quæ affert exempla, aut si qua similia

reperiuntur, præsens pro aoristo poni posse evincunt. Etenim ubique in his verbi modis videndum, utrum de re permanente vel aliquamdiu durante, an de eo, quod cito transit, agatur. Recte dicit Deianira, φοβοῦμαι μὴ καλῆται, quia hoc manet, neque semel, sed semper ita vocatum iri Herculem putet, ne illud commemorem, ex iis, quæ ante dixerat, coniici posse, eam omnino non de re futura, sed de præsente loqui. Si καλῆθῃ dixisset, significaret, *metuo ne hanc appellationem accipiat*, quod unius momenti est. Eodem modo Aristophanes μὴ προσποιῇ dixit, *ne affectes thea*: προσποιήσῃ si dixisset, id esset *ne petas*: quod semel et paucis fit, quum illud diuturnum sit et permanentem voluntatem indicet. In adnotatione ita scribit: "Aristophanes Vesp. 1432. ὕβρις, ἕως ἂν τὴν δίκην ἀρχῶν καλῇ. Quis non mallet καλέσῃ, si per metrum liceret?" Hoc alius generis est. Nam iidem modi sæpe etiam propria temporum suorum significatione usurpantur, neque id tamen temere et sine caussa. Si καλέσῃ dixisset, sensus esset: *iace contumelias, usque dum litem vocaverit archon*. At hoc minus accurate dictum foret: iam enim dum ille vocat, cadet spiritus Philocleoni. Itaque recte dicit ἕως ἂν καλῇ, *usque dum vocet*, i. e. quamdiu non vocabit. Valde idoneum huic rei illustrandæ est illud Xenophontis Cyrop. iii. 3, 18. καὶ οὐκ ἀναμένομεν, ἕως ἂν ἡμετέρα χώρα κακῶται: *neque exspectamus dum nostram regionem vastare incipiant*. Κακῶθῃ si dixisset, nemo non videt quam id alienum foret: *dum vastaverint*. Herodotum vero, qui vii. 141. scripsit, ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ τῆδε μενέομεν, ἔστ' ἂν καὶ τελευτήσωμεν, apertum est nullo modo scribere potuisse τελευτῶμεν. Addit Elmsleius in alia adnotatione, si vera sint, quæ nos ad Aiace v. 272. dixerimus, apud Euripidem potius μὴ τι βουλευεῖς scribendum fore. Sed veretur, ne id non recte contenderimus, siquidem non meminerit, se apud Atticos poetas legere δέδοικα μὴ ἔστι, nec putet eos nisi in præteritis verborum temporibus indicativo uti. Non negamus, pleraque huius constructionis exempla præteritum habere: sed quum per se intelligatur, ubi præterito perfecto locus sit, recte etiam præsens poni, apparet nihil esse, quod præsentis indicativum usurpari prohibeat. Sed operæ pretium est, hanc rem accuratius considerare, ut eius causæ in clara luce conspici possint. Bene Schæferus in Meletem. p. 115. seq. docuit, quid differat, utrum dicas, ὅρα καθ' ὕπνον μὴ κατακλιθεῖς κυρεῖ, an, ὅρα μὴ κυρεῖ. Indicativo enim significari, *vide num dormiat*; Coniunctivo, *vide ne dormiat*, i. e. vereor, ne dormiat. Horum illud est nescientis, sitne quid, an non sit; hoc autem metuentis, ne sit. Utrumque aut est, aut non est:

sed qui nescit, utrum sit, an non sit, nihil nisi veritatem rei cognoscere vult, i. e. eum, in quo nunc res est, statum; qui autem metuit, ne sit, cupit non esse, operamque dari vult, ut, si non est, ne fiat; si est, ut esse desinat: quod est futuri temporis. Quare ille indicativo, ut qui verum rei statum indicet; hic coniunctivo, in quo futuri significatio inest, utitur. Neque enim existimandum est, diversas esse significationes particulæ *μή*, ut quum Latine *num* et *ne* dicimus, quorum altera indicativum, altera coniunctivum requirat. Nam si ita esset, non posset illa particula uno eodemque in loco simul utramque significationem habere, quod necessarium foret, ubi cum utroque modo coniuncta est, ut apud Euripidem in Phœn. 90.

ἐπὶ σῆχος, ὡς ἂν προὔξερυνήσω στίβον,
μή τις πολιτῶν ἐν τρίβῳ φαντάζεται,
κάμολ μὲν ἔλθῃ φαῦλος ὡς δούλω ψόγος,
σοὶ δ', ὡς ἀνάσση.

Nam ut priora recte veritas, *num quis in via appareat*, at mox necessario debebis dicere, *ne reprehendar*. Recte vero utrumque sic dices: *ne quis appareat, reprehendarque*. Quod si non in particula caussa inest, cur indicativus aut coniunctivus adhibeatur, num forte inest in verbo, ex quo pendet particula? Ne hoc quidem. Esto enim, ut ὄρα μὴ εὔδει et ὄρα μὴ εὔδῃ duplicem admittat verbi significationem, alteram cognoscendi, alteram cavendi: at ea ipsa verba, quæ quam maxime cavendi metuendique notionem habent, indicativo iunguntur. Homerus Od. E. 300.

δεῖδω, μὴ δὴ πάντα θεὰ νημερτέα εἶπεν.

Thucyd. iii. 53. νῦν δὲ φοβούμεθα, μὴ ἀμφοτέρων ἅμα ἡμαρτήκαμεν. Vide Matthiæ Gr. Gr. §. 520. not. 5. Cur vero alter non εἶπῃ, alter non ἡμαρτήκωμεν dixit, quum utrique liceret? Homerum dicat quis ambiguitatem vitare voluisse, quum εἶπῃ et dixerit et *elicit* significare possit. Esto: (sane enim ambiguum est εἶπῃ, ut de uno cæ sermone. Nulla ambiguitas apud Platonem Cratyl. p. 517. A. ἀλλὰ μέντοι πολλοῦ γε δεῖ, ὃ Σώκρατες, μὴ ποτέ τις τῶν νῦν ἔργα τοιαῦτα ἐργάσσηται: ubi quum de pluribus factis sermo sit, ἐργάσσηται necessario est *perfecerit*, ut Heindorfius interpretatur: nam de præsentis tempore eb eandem causam ἐργάζεται dicendum erat, quod quidem Basileensis secunda habet, ne unum, idque breve factum intelligatur.) Sed quid Thucydidem censebimus? Nam in perfecti coniunctivo nulla ambiguitas est. Nimirum de præteritis proprie non possumus metuere, quia omnis metus de futuro est. Itaque ubi de re præterita metui-

mus, nihil aliud possumus metuere, quam ne cognoscamus factum esse, quod nolimus evenisse. Aliter, si de tali re nos *metuere* dicimus, abutimur verbo metuendi, ut nihil nisi nescire nos, quid factum sit, significemus. Ut si quis de amici vita sollicitus sit, is si dicit, *δέδοικα μὴ τεθνήκῃ*, hoc dicit, *metuo ne mortuum esse accipiam*. Sin dicat, *δέδοικα μὴ τέθνηκε*, non sollicitudinem suam, et metum, sed opinionem significabit. Iam quum in plerisque rebus præteritis frustra sit metuere quidquam, satis plerumque est, si tantummodo opinionem nostram indicamus. Eadem vero etiam, præsentium ratio est. Nam quod iam est, cæpit esse, eoque non amplius metui ut futurum potest. Ut si Euripides dixisset, *ὀρῶδιά μοι, μὴ τι βουλεύεις κακόν*: i. e. *opinor te aliquid mali agitare*. Pertinent huc etiam ea, quæ semper sunt. Lucianus Hermotim. c. 53. t. 1. p. 797. εἰδέναι δὲ ὅστις ὁ τάληθῃ λέγων ἐστίν, ὅρα μὴ οὐχὶ μαρίον ἐστὶν ἡμέρας, ἀλλὰ πολλῶν ἡμερῶν δέηται. Schæferus in Meletem. p. 115. δέεται scribi iubet, quod neque necessarium et minus elegans est. Quum enim, quod non potest particula aliqua diei perfici, non continuo integros multos dies impleat, distincte apteque Lucianus indicativum de eo, quod certum videretur; coniunctivum de eo, quod dubitationi obnoxium esset, posuit: *non particulae diei, opinor, est, sed vereor ne sit multorum dierum*. Etiam in futuris hæc ratio obtinet. Xenophon Arab. I. 8, 24. ἔθα δὲ Κύρος, δείσας μὴ ὅπισθεν γενόμενος κατακόψει τὸ Ἑλληνικόν, ἐλαύνει ἀντίος. Sic edd. vett. i. e. *putans eum a terga impetum facturum*. Recentiore edd. scriptura *κατακόψει* metum potius indicat, *veritus ne impetum faceret*. Sed satis dictum ad illud illustrandum, quod volebam. Infinita enim hæc et inexhausta materia est. Unum tamen addam, ad quod velim attendant, qui de his rebus quærent. Quum omnis metus ad futura spectet, non est idem, præsentisne coniunctivo, an coniunctivo aoristi, an futuro utare. Nam coniunctivus, cuiuscumque ille temporis sit, ad ea refertur, quæ certo tempore, et quidem, si non diserte, est definitum, eo, quod nunc instat, futura esse metuimus; ita quidem, ut præsentis coniunctivus de re vel diutius durante, vel sæpius repetenda, aoristi autem de uno eoque celeriter peragendo facto intelligatur. Futuro autem ibi locus est, ubi quid infinito tempore, i. e. aliquando eventurum metuimus. Triâ harum trium formarum vicina exempla sunt in Aristophanis Ecclesiâzussis: primum v. 465.

ἐκεῖνο δεινὸν τοῖσιν ἡλίκοισι γῶν,
μὴ καταλαβοῦσαι τῆς πόλεως τὰς ἡνίας,
ἔπειτ' ἀναγκάζωσι πρὸς βίαν
κινεῖν ἐκυτάς.

Secundum v. 481.

Φύλαττε σαυτὸν ἀσφαλῶς, πολλοὶ γὰρ οἱ πανούργοι,
μήπου τις ἐκ τοῦπισθὲν ὦν τὸ σχῆμα καταφυλάξῃ.

Tertium v. 486.

πρὸς ταῦτα συστέλλου σεαυτὴν,
κύκλω περισκοπούμενη τὰκείσε καὶ τὰ τῆδε
ἐκ δεξιῶν, μὴ ξύμφορὰ γενήσεται τὸ πρᾶγμα.

Non obstant his talia, qualis Xenophontis locus est, quem modo vidimus. In quo etsi scribi potest, quod Schneidero in mentem venit, κατακόψει, tamen futurum, si de opinione accipitur, recte se habet; non, si de metu. Scilicet hoc illud est, in quo difficultas linguae Graecae posita est, quod multa, quae eodem modo dicuntur, alibi alios explicatus habent. In eadem adnotatione quod de Herodoti loco vii. 103. Elmsleius nobis contradixit, recte fecit. Nam sane, quod ibi scriptum est, ὅρα μὴ μάτην κόμπος ὁ λόγος οὗτος ὁ εἰρημένος εἴη, non debebamus interpretari, *vide ne fuerit*, quum optativus, licet saepe de praeteritis usurpetur, tamen non aliter ad praeterita referatur, nisi si alio verbo id tempus indicatum sit. Sed minime tamen in eo accedendum putans Elmsleio, quod sine dubio εἴη apud Herodotum scribendum esse dicit. Nam ἥ consuevit ille dicere, etsi in plurali ἕωσι scribit. Sanum vero est, nisi vehementer fallimus, quod libri omnes habent, εἴη, sed aliter, quam ad Ajacem diximus, explicandum. Quod intelligetur, considerata omni verborum complexione, quae haec est: εἰ γὰρ κείων ἕκαστος δέκα ἀνδρῶν τῆς στρατιῆς τῆς ἐμῆς ἀντάξιός ἐστι, σὲ δὲ γε δίζημαι εἴκοσι εἶναι ἀντάξιον· καὶ οὕτω μὲν ὀρθοῖτ' ἂν ὁ λόγος ὁ παρὰ σεῦ εἰρημένος· εἰ δὲ τοιοῦτοί τε ἔοντες καὶ μεγάθεα τοσοῦτοι, οἷος σύ τε καὶ οἱ παρ' ἐμὲ φοιτῶσι Ἑλλήνων ἐς λόγους, αὐχεῖτε τοσοῦτον, ὅρα μὴ μάτην κόμπος ὁ λόγος οὗτος ὁ εἰρημένος εἴη. Hoc dicit: *si non maiore, quam tu atque alii Graecorum, quos ego vidi, robore praediti tantopere gloriamini, vide ne vana ista iactatio foret*. Laeditur, ut saepe fit, negligentius, apodosi ad aliam rationem protaseos conformata: id quod alio modo etiam in priore parte huius periodi fecit. Debebant enim omnia hoc ordine procedere: *si singuli vestrum decem ex nostris pares essent, recte se haberet, quod dicis; sed si nihil nobis meliores it gloriaremini, vana diceretis*. At, inquit aliquis, si hoc volebat, addere debebat ἂν. Potuit addere: *sed potuit etiam omitti* e. Recte enim omittitur haec particula in altero membro orationis, quod ita comparatum est, ut pro parte eius sententiae, cui additum est ἂν, haberi possit. Aeschylus Agam. 1058.

πείθοι' ἂν, εἰ πείθοι· ἀπειθοίης δ' ἴσως.

Alia exempla vide apud Xenophontem Hier. vi. 15. xi. 11—13. Ita hic, si in pauca contrahas, hoc dicit Herodotus: καὶ οὕτω μὲν ὁρθῶν τ' αὖν ὁ λόγος, ἀλλὰ δὲ ἰάτην κόμπος εἴη.

V. 313. Præfert Elmsleius ὡς δ' αὐτως cum spiritu aspero. Accentum enim docere, non ab αὐτὸς derivatum esse hoc adverbium, sed a feminino αἶτη, ut οὕτως a masculino οὗτος. Non intercedimus, quin ita videatur formam verbi intuentibus. Sed qui etiam significationem respiciunt, iis aliter videri debere contendimus. Mirum primo, a feminino derivatum esse adverbium. Verum esto ita: quid est, quod, si οὗτος et αὐτή significatu non differunt, nisi quod sunt genere diversa, οὕτως et αὐτως diversissimas habeant significationes, et quidem αὐτως eam, quæ non ab αὐτῇ, sed unice ab αὐτῇ, si femininis utendum est, petita sit? Unde quis non potius colligat, αὐτῆς veram scripturam esse, accentum autem ab regula recedere? Cæterum ad sensum Euripidis versuum quod attinet, non satis planum est, quid statuat vir doctissimus. Verba sunt hæc:

γυνὴ γὰρ ὀξύθυμος, ὡς δ' αὐτὸς ἀνὴρ,
ἐξέον φυλάσσειν, ἢ σιωπηλὸς σοφός.

Affect scholiastæ auctoritatem, qui φυλάσσειν pro φυλαχθῆναι, i. e. τηρηθῆναι, dictum ait, activum pro passivo. Sed de hac re nullam controversiam esse. Fuisse autem, qui ἐξέον φυλάσσειν, etsi Græcum esset, tamen ab hoc loco alienum esse censerent, quod hic φυλάσσειν dicendum fuisset, ut Dawesium. Respondere huic Dorvillium, φυλάσσειν esse observare aliquem, ne aliquid faciat, auctore Demosthene. Hanc interpretationem probare Heathium et Musgravium. Nisi fallimur, ipse quoque probat. Debet certe. Quinquam aliquid suspicionis præbet, se in illo acquiescere, quod dixerat, activum pro passivo positum esse. At eo nihil efficeret. Nam etiam φυλάσσειν si hic scriptum esset, activi vim haberet, ut cavere significans. Itaque de eo potius agebatur, utrum id verbum hic cavere, an custodire significaret. Non potest autem aliud quam custodire. Præterea aliud erit in his versibus, de quo accuratius quaerere debebat Elmsleius, quam cum fecisse videmus. Ubi scholiastæ verba attulit ἐξέον ἐστὶ φυλάττειν-σθαι, φησὶν, ὀξύθυμος ἀνὴρ, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ γυνή, Dawesium dicit scripsisse ἀνὴρ γὰρ ὀξύθυμος, ὡς δ' αὐτῶς γυνή; sed vulgatim agnoscere alterum scholiasten, πᾶσα γὰρ, φησὶν, ὀξύθυμος γυνή, ἐξέον δὲ καὶ ἀνὴρ. εὐμαρ-στορον ἀν φυλαχθῆναι, ἢ ὁ κρύπτων τὴν ὀργήν, eamque stabiliri poetæ verbis in Andr. 673.

ἰδικομένη πρὸς ἄνδρς, ὡς δ' αὖτως ἄνδρ,
γυναῖκα μεγαλύνουσιν ἐν δόμοις ἔχον.

Accidit hic quoque viro doctissimo, quod sæpius, ut in verbis hærens sententiam verborum negligeret. Nihil prorsus similitudinis est inter hos duos locos, quum quod in utroque verba sunt ὡς δ' αὖτως ἄνδρ. Nam in Andromacha hoc dicit poëta : par mulieri, si ei a marito iniuria fit, ius est, ac viro : sed vir in se ipso præsidium habet, mulier in parentibus et cognatis. In Medea vero, de viro an de muliere agitur, nihil interest : sermo est enim de omnibus, qui ad iram provi sunt, sive viri sint, sive mulieres. Quod si in Andromacha necessario dici debuit ὡς δ' αὖτως ἄνδρ, hic autem etiam ὡς δ' αὖτως γυνή, dici potuit, quid Andromachæ locus ad stabiliendam vulgatam in Medea confert ? At dicet fortasse, etiam in Medea de muliere agi. Vero : at non quia mulier, sed quia homo est. Itaque alio modo quæri debebat, utra scriptura melior esset : notandaque erat negligentia poëtæ in opponendis iis, quæ sibi non recte opponuntur. Nam primo δξύθυμοις σιωπηλοὶ opponendi erant. Nunc opponit σιωπηλοὺς σοφοὺς, quod sic demum recte fecisset, si antea μακροὺς δξύθυμους commemorasset. Deinde etsi de muliere sermo est, tamen, quia non proprium est mulierum, quod de Medea prædicat, sed commune omnium hominum, nec mulieres nec viros, sed homines dicere debebat. At id non fecit, sed prouti hanc aut alteram scripturam probaveris, mulierem aut virum nominat, et deinde sese corrigens, alterum sexum addit. Utrumque aliquam rationem habet. Nam si dixit, ἀνὴρ γὰρ ἐξέστημος, ὡς δ' αὖτως γυνή, existimandus erit in generali sententia virum ut potiore nominasse, sed quoniam hic de Medea loquitur, discrete deinde, ne propter ambiguitatem vocabuli de solis loqui viris videretur, adiciendum putasse, eandem esse etiam mulieris conditionem. Sin dixit, γυνή γὰρ ἐξέστημος, ὡς δ' αὖτως ἄνδρ, quoniam Medeam in mente haberet, de muliere dicere incepisse, sed, ne quis id in solas mulieres dictum putaret, adiecisse deinde viros. Et hoc quidem veri similis videtur, ut quod metui, in quo est magis consentaneum sit. Neque vero prætereundum erat, quum illud σοφὸς addit, respicere cum, quod ipse ante dixerat, σοφὴ πέφυκε, et quod Medea responderat, οὐκ ἔστι γὰρ οὐσα, et quæ sequuntur, tum, καὶ δ' οὐκ ἄγαν σφί.

V. 318. Repudiavit Elmsleius scripturam MS. Cott. et ed. Latæ. γούαν, negans ea forma usos esse tragicos contra Porsonum ad Phœn. 866. qui nobis quidem sapienter scripsisse videtur : "neque ratio fingi potest, cur tragici hac forma abstinerint." Meminerit velimus Elmsleius suorum ipsius verborum, quæ supra ad v. 147. attulimur.

V. 326. Non dixerim ego quidem utrumque bonum esse, μή λάθῃ et μή λ. θαι. Hic, ubi aperte optat, non iubet Medea, optativus unice præferendus.

V. 326. Quæ Elmsleius ad hunc versum in subiecta adnotatione de elisionibus ante penultimam arsin in iambicis et trochæicis versibus disputavit, non libet persequi. Satis ducimus monere, non ipsis esse elisiones per se spectandas, sed verborum quoque in loco et interpunctionum rationes. Aliter et cæca manet hæc diligentia, et corrumpendis aliquot locis ansam præbet.

V. 326. Laudandum quidem censemus Elmsleium, qui, quod Matthiæ quoque fecit, librorum scripturam revocaverit, *πονοῦμεν ἡμεῖς κ' ὑ πόνοις κεχρημένα*, neque admiserit coniecturam Musgraviæ, quam non modo Brunckius, sed, quod mirere, Porsonus ut certissimam recepit, *πόνος μέν ἡμεῖς δ' οὐ πόνοις κεχρημένα*; sed quum sibi frigidum in his verbis iocum invenire Elmsleius videretur, ab eo alienissimus fuit Euripides. Fraudem scilicet fieri sibi prius est V. D. a scholiasta et Buchanano, qui vertit, *curæ premunt me, nec egeo curis novis*. Mirum profecto, latuisse viros doctos usitatissimam dicendi rationem, qua Græci, ut quid confirment et corroborent, idem iterum dicunt negando contrario, qualia sunt *γινώσκω, κοῦκ ἀγνώσκω*, et millena alia. Itaque quum Creon dixisset, *desine mihi laborem facessere*, respondet Mædea, *ego νεῖο laboro, neque indiga sum laborum*, i. e. immo ego, et quidem plus satis laborum habeo. Similiter in Herc. fur, 1245.

γεμω κακὸν δὴ, κοῦκ ἔτ' ἔσθ' ὅπου τεθῇ.

V. 325. "Nescio," inquit, "an legendum ὁ φευξοῦμεθα." Cur vero, quum ἡ φευξοῦμεθα hic potius, quam ὁ φευξοῦμεθα dicendum fuerit? Quid intersit, diximus ad Herc. fur. 1236.

V. 346. Iterum hic, ut supra ad v. 87., solæcum videtur Elmsleio ei: unde in Herc. fur. 1315. ubi legebatur, *αἰοδῶν ἔπερ οὐ ψυχοῖς λόγοι*, recte in Matthiæ editione repositum dicit *ἀψευδεῖς*. Monuimus iam ad v. 87. esse, ubi recte dicatur *εἰ οὐ*. Sed ne exempla requirantur, en quædam. Homerus Od. β. 274.

εἰ δ' οὐ καὶ γ' ἐσσι γόνος καὶ Πηνελόπειης.

Antiphanes ap. Athen. iii. p. 99. A.

ἐκ τοῦ γὰρ εἶναι λέγονεν εἰ δ' οὐκ ἦν, ὅθεν, πῶς ἔγενετ' ἐξ οὐκ ὄντος;

Herodotus vii. 9. καὶ γὰρ δεινὸν ἂν εἴη πρᾶγμα, εἰ Σάκας μὲν καὶ Ἰνδοὺς καὶ Αἰθίοπας καὶ Ἀσσυρίους, ἀλλὰ τε ἔθνη πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα, ἀνίκησαντα Πέρσας οὐδεὶς, ἀλλὰ δύναμιν ἀποκταῖσθαι βαυλομένην, καὶ

ταστροφάμενοι δούλους ἔχομεν Ἕλληνας δὲ, ὑπάρξαντας ἀδικίης, οὐ τιμωρησόμεθα. Eodem modo Andocides de myster. p. 13. (51. Reisk.) οὐκοῦν δεινόν, εἰ ὑπὸ μὲν τούτων διὰ τοῦτ' ἂν ἀπωλόμην, ἔτι εἰς τὴν πόλιν οὐδὲν ἡμαρτον, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐτέρους ἀπέκτειναν ἐν ὑμῖν δὲ κρινόμενος, οὐς οὐδὲν κακὸν πεποίηκα, οὐ σωθήσομαι; et Æschines c. Ctesiph. p. 641. seq. ed. Reisk. cuius locum, quia longior est, nolo adscribere. Andocides de myster. p. 5. (17. Reisk.) εἰ δὲ οὐδὲν ἡμαρτηταί μοι. Pythagoreus incertus in Galii Opusc. p. 725. ἀλλὰ γὰρ φαντὶ ὥς ταῦτα μὲν λέγοντι, ὅταν τις αὐτοὺς ἐρωτῇ· ἀλλὰ τοὶ μὲν σοφοί, τῶ δέοντι· τοὶ δὲ μαινώμενοι, εἰ οὐ δεῖ.

V. 409. Facile accedimus viro doctissimo, futurum reponendum indicanti. Sed quod στρέφουσι in στέψουσι mutari vult, non probamus, multoque melius esse censemus, quod, si illud displiceat, proponit, στρέψουσι. Nam non solum mutatio minor est, sed ipsum etiam verbum huic loco longe est convenientius, ut in quo id ipsum dicere velit poëta, conversum iri contemptum mulierum in laudem.

V. 420. Adscivit Elmsleius, quod Porsonus ex sola Aldina posuit, πατρίων pro πατράων, eodem argumento, quo v. 428. μένει potius quam μίμνει legendum sit. Negamus vero, parem utriusque verbi conditionem esse. Nam μένει et μίμνει, præterquam quod durissima foret correptio ante μν, neque significatu, utque colore differunt: quod non est in πάτριος et πατρώος, quæ quum significatu differant, differunt etiam colore, i. e. potestate, quam ad animi affectionem habent per ea, quæ adsignificantur, etiam ubi ad rem ipsam idem est, utro vocabulo utare. Obscure differentiam indicavit grammaticus in Bekkeri Anecd. T. 1. p. 297, 30. πατρῶα λέγουσιν οἱ ῥήτορες χρήματα καὶ κτήματα καὶ τόπους, πάτρια δὲ τὰ ἔθνη καὶ τὰ νόμιμα καὶ τὰ μυστήρια καὶ τὰς ἐορτάς, πατρικὸν δὲ φίλον ἢ ἐχθρόν. Differunt hæc ita: πάτρια sunt, quæ sunt patris; πατρῶα, quæ veniunt a patre, πατρικῶς, qualia sunt patris. Ita Pindarus proprie dixit πατρία ὄσσα, πατρία ὁδὸς Ol. VI. 106. Nem. II. 9. Πατρῶα autem tantum abest ut eadem sint quæ πάτρια, ut sint ea, quæ sunt κατὰ τὰ πάτρια. Ut ad Euripidem revertar, ad rem ipsam quidem idem est, utrum ἐκ πατρίων, an ἐκ πατράων οἴκων profuga dicatur Medea, sed vim tamen non eandem utrumque verbum habet. Nam patris domum qui relinquit, non videtur suam relinquere domum; patria domo autem qui excedit, sua domo caret, in qua habitare eum ius erat. Ita spurio filio πῶτριος οἶκος est, genuino πατρώος, si proprie verba usurpamus. Quod autem ad mensuram medix syllabæ attinet, quid impedit, quin, si γεραίος, δειλῆος, atque alia, media correpta dicuntur, idem etiam in

vocabulo πατρώος fieri potuerit? Modo apte fiat. Neminem autem opinamur tam invenustum esse, ut non sponte sentiat, eam correptionem in vocabulo primam syllabam natura brevem habente non aliter sine elegantiae detrimento admitti posse, nisi si ictus in ultimam incidat, prima autem, licet propter duplicem consonantem produci possit, brevis maneat. Quare nihil offensionis habent talia,

σὺ δ' ἐκ μὲν οἴκων πατρώων ἔπλευσας
ξείνου πατρώου φυλακαῖσιν.

At turpissimus foret versus Glyconeus Pindari Nem. II. 9. si sic scriptus esset:

ὀφείλει δ' ἔτι πατρώαν.

V. 431. Quum pro vulgato τῶν δὲ λέκτρων Porsonus σῶν τε λέκτρων coniecisset, (sentiebat enim et articulum languidum esse, et prægresso οὔτε respondere aliquid debere) recepit eam coniecturam Elmsleius. Et σῶν quidem nemo erit quin verum esse intelligat, δὲ autem nollemus mutatum, quod recte et apte hic ad οὔτε refertur. Sæpe sibi τε et δὲ respondent, ubi singula membra et verbum suum habent, et res eiusmodi est, ut quæ per τε et partes disiungi cœperant, etiam opponi sibi possint. Sophocles Œd. Col. 367.

πρὶν μὲν γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἦν ἔως Κρέοντι τε
θρόνους ἑᾶσθαι, μηδὲ χραίνεσθαι πόλιν.

Vide Brunnium ad Æsch. S. c. Theb. 835. Sic etiam Latini, et et autem coniungunt. Est autem in his rebus illa quam dicunt grata negligentia posita, quæ libera ab exili grammaticorum severitate ita quoque in loco conformat orationem, uti sententia postulat. Eo fine enim inventa est oratio, ut id, quod sentiamus, apte accommodateque exprimat. Et hoc in genere sæpius, videmus Elmsleium veteres scriptores ad eum modum corrigere, quo ludimagistri pueros solent, quum primum scribere discunt. At illi regulas discere debent: sed has qui iam didicerunt, his licet eas etiam aliquando prudenter negligere.

A LETTER

To the Rev. Dr. LEE, Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge, on the New Translation of the Scriptures, in answer to a Letter received from him, May, 1820.

SIR,

THE contents of your letter do not surprise me, as I do not expect that every gentleman in an official situation will approve any attempt to amend the authorised translation, however it may be consistent with the original Hebrew, except such as are determined to abide by the revealed truth, in preference to every other consideration. You may see, Sir, by my writings, that this is not the case as it respects myself: I am free from the shackles of prejudice, fear, and influence; and if I were so circumstanced, I trust I should prefer the literal scriptural truth, which holds forth the unimpeachableness of the holy character of God, and of those by whom he has given his word, to every other consideration whatever.

A different state of things appears to be coming forward, very much opposed to any thing that has ever been known, of which some of the clergy seem not to be sensible, or, if they be, they are not willing to look the danger in the face. The system of national instruction has prepared the present, and is preparing the rising generation, to read and investigate for themselves: millions of pamphlets are circulating throughout the kingdom, calculated to bring the sacred volume into contempt, and which are now read with eagerness by the great mass of the people; the direful effect of which has already begun to be manifested, not only in the lower orders; but many in the higher circles are unwise enough to say, that the deistical publications are excellent works, and seem to rejoice at the exposure of the characters of the sacred writers as held forth in the authorised translations. What, Sir, could be my motive, think you, in opposing the mighty torrent of deism which threaten to overturn the church and government, and which puts those in danger, whose persons are more sacred than others on account of their office and situations? Nothing, I think you will allow, but the earnest desire of putting a stop as much as possible to such proceedings, by removing the very ground of those objections with which the enemies of the Bible are endeavouring to bring about a state of anarchy and ruin.

It is allowed by those who are very able Hebrew scholars, that I have been successful in correcting many important passages, which is the only effectual way of silencing the objections; for if such contradictions be permitted to remain as now pervade the pages of the common version, with the facility and earnestness by which deists circulate the objections to the Bible, it must appear evident to every thinking man, that deism will soon be the profession of more of the people of England.

When you have read the *Critical Examination*, in answer to Mr. Whittaker's book, I am of opinion that you will think with all others who have read it, that the admission that the *original Hebrew Scriptures, the inspired volume, is corrupt*, will greatly aid the cause of deism, more particularly so when it is known that this *dogma* is sanctioned by some of the University of Cambridge. For as the Vulgate and the Septuagint are acknowledged to abound with errors, if the Hebrew abound with errors also, there would, if it were generally credited, be an end to the religion of the Bible, and to all Christian governments. It is dangerous if the inaccuracies in the common version be retained; for these are the weapons with which the enemies of divine revelation will ultimately effect their purpose in cutting up the very roots of the religion of the Bible. Nothing is more astonishing to persons of learning and liberality, than that those, whose interest it is to obviate the pernicious objections of the deists, should wish to retain what some call "consecrated errors," pour forth their invectives against all who attempt to aid the cause of the Bible, by refuting the objections, and who, in a spirit diametrically opposed to the spirit of Christianity, even descend to personal abuse in language so gross for repetition. But, Sir, from the tenor of your letter, should you think of entering the phalanx of reviewers to oppose any amendment of the common version, I expect better things from you: civility, good manners, and language worthy of the Christian, are always more welcome to the public than indelicacy and abuse; it is either a bad cause, or a bad spirit, that requires the latter to support it. Should you resolve to take up your pen, I hope you will attempt to do that which none of the opposers of *sacred truth* have attempted to do, viz. *to prove that the Scriptures do not impeach the moral justice of God—that there are no contradictions in the Hebrew text—that there are no exceptionable expressions in the original.*—All these important things have been neglected, and personal abuse resorted to instead of it. Those who cannot do good ought not to push themselves before the public for critics in Hebrew, because they furnish an argument for the Deist, instead of aiding the cause of the Bible. Neither is it, to be taken up hastily, as has been the case, or by those who have not made the Hebrew their study for a series of years.

360 *Letter to Dr. Lee, on the Scriptures.*

It is our most imperious duty to remove from the erroneous translation whatever is contradictory and unworthy of God, as not any thing of this nature could possibly come from him. "And if we find any absurd or immoral precept, it carries its own condemnation with it, and all reasonable creatures are bound to reject it," says an eminent commentator in the Church of England. Hitherto all the writers who have attempted to find fault with the new translation, have been uniform in not venturing to improve any passage in the translation, however absurd or contradictory to other Scriptures, or however such passages may impeach the moral justice of God.

If you take up the subject on the ground of those who have hitherto amused their readers,—that is, on the purity and views of the translation of Jerom, as copied in the common version,—the replies to such are allowed by able and impartial judges to be conclusive, because confirmed by other parts of the sacred record. Whatever may be your design,—whether you be of opinion with those eminent Hebrew scholars I have mentioned in the introduction to the Bible, or whether you be not,—I hope you will abide strictly by the grammar, idiom, spirit, and phraseology of the sacred language; and where you find the Hebrew essentially to differ from the authorised version, I hope, for the credit of the University, you will endeavour to remove such objections as shake the very foundation of the Bible and the Church. I hope that nothing will escape from your pen similar to a passage I have just read in a pamphlet published by an Oxford Divine, viz. "*His proposal goes to the formation of a theological version, which may obviate the scoffs of infidelity, silence controversy, and preclude scepticism. What critic can approve of such a project?*"

As it seems to be your intention to say something on the new translation, you can have no objection to my sending this letter to the periodicals for insertion. Truth being my only object, I think, in justice to myself, every thing of this nature should come before those who are not influenced by fear or interest. Such are the men I revere; and I assure you, I sincerely pity those who think it prudent to swim without reflection down the stream of popular opinion.

I am, Sir, &c.

J. BELLAMY.

ADVERSARIA LITERARIA.

NO. XXIV.

Discovery of a verse of Homer, and Error of Kiessling.

The following verse is ascribed by Proclus, on the *Timæus* of Plato (p. 334), to Homer, but is not to be found in any of the writings of that poet which are now extant. The line is,

Ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς πρότερος γέγονει, καὶ πλείονα ᾔδει.

i. e. "But Jove was born the first, and more he knows."

This verse is also alluded to by Proclus in p. 253. of the same work. If Proclus had not, after quoting this verse, immediately added *φησὶν Ὀμηρος*, I should have concluded from the manner of it, that it was an Orphic line.

The word *δυναμὶς*, which is used by Iamblichus in his treatise *Περὶ Βίου Πυθαγορικοῦ*, in the sense in which it is used by mathematicians universally, was not properly understood by Kiessling, the German editor of this work, as will be at once evident to the Geometrical reader, from a perusal of what he says concerning it. The passage in which this word occurs in Iamblichus is the following. *βουλομενος δὲ τὴν ἐν τοῖς ἀνίστοις καὶ ἀσυμμετροῖς καὶ ἀπείροις πεπερασμένην καὶ ἴσῃν καὶ συμμετρικαὶ συνὴν παραδείξαι, καὶ, ὅπως δεῖ αὐτὴν ἀσκεῖν, ὑψηλῆσθαι, τὴν δὲ δικαιοσύνην ἐξ ὑποδείξεως τῷ σχήματι εἰκάζει, ὅπερ μόνον τῶν γεωμετρικῶν διαγραμμάτων ἀπείρους μὲν ἔχον τὰς τῶν σχημάτων συστάσεις, ἀνομοίως δὲ ἀλλήλοις διακειμένων, ἴσας ἔχει τὰς τῆς δυναμὸς ἀποδείξεις.* (p. 376); i. e. "Pythagoras, being desirous to exhibit in things unequal, without symmetry and infinite, a definite, equal, and commensurate justice, and to show how it ought to be exercised, said, that justice resembles that figure, which is the only one among geometrical diagrams, that having indeed infinite compositions of figures, but dissimilarly disposed with reference to each other, yet has equal demonstrations of power."

Iamblichus here alludes to a right-angled triangle, and the Pythagoric theorem of 47. 1. of Euclid, and not only to this theorem, but also to the 31st of the 6th book of Euclid. For in the former of these it is shown that the square described on the longest side of the right-angled triangle is equal to the two squares described on the two other sides. And in the latter it is demonstrated, that any figure described on the longest side is equal to the figures which are like and alike situated to the

former figure, and which are described on the two other sides. Hence, the longest side is said by geometricians to be in power equal to the powers of the other sides. Kiessling, however, not understanding this, says, "that power is the space contained between the concurring lines of figures, and is the area of the triangle." "*Δυναμὶς* idem est, quod *σπαθον*, spatium, quod intra concurrentes lineas figurarum continetur, area trigoni."

From this passage also it may be inferred, that the theorem of 31. 6. of Euclid was not unknown to Pythagoras.

THOMAS TAYLOR.

The author of the following simple verses, by name Catlyn, was once the Master of the Grammar School at Hull, to which station he raised himself entirely by his own genius and merits. It is said that he was originally a bricklayer, but by mere force of talent and perseverance, greatly distinguished himself in the fields of science. His promotion in life, in more respects than one, resembled that of his contemporary Ben. Jonson; for it is said that that celebrated dramatist in his earlier years wielded the trowel. Like Jonson, too, Catlyn was repeatedly assailed by the shafts of envy and malice. His enemies were ever officiously ready tauntingly to remind him of his former profession, and mortify his feelings on every opportunity. But, conscious of his own worth and independence, he could fling back their unmanly taunts, and has shown us that the recollection of his former mean state never called a blush on his cheek; and though he was in no common degree attacked by envy, the malice of his adversaries only drew from him the following retort.

Hull, 16th April, 1820.

Ad popularem hydram.

Res satis nota est neque me molestat
Dum mihi questum renovas priorem,
Nec pudet trulla patris sub armis

Me meruisse.

Nam mihi quod vult vitio popellus

Invidus verti: sapientiores

Id mihi laudi tribuere, necum

Non moritara.

Qui suis legat decus atque nomen,

Is foret famæ melioris illo,

Quo domus patris patriusque splendor

Languidus exit.

Elegiac Ode, on the Death of King George III.

If you will favor the following Elegiac Ode, on the death of our late revered Sovereign, with a place in your excellent publication, you will much oblige me, and perhaps gratify some other of your readers,—I am, &c.

המלך הצדק ונדיב מת
 שבע ימים בשיבת המנוחה
 ידאת יהוה תוסיף ימים
 אף גם אדם לעמל יולד
 והקטנים והגדלים ימתו
 חפץ יהוה לענות את מלך
 כיטח עיניו מראות
 ומעמו מהשכיל בוקדו
 ובזאת יקל חסד מצרו
 ודמעתו לא תבוא
 אך עתה ירד עם בנן שאלה
 "איך נפלו גברים
 ואבדו כלי מלחמה
 אל תבירו בנת
 אל תבשרו בתיצת אשקלון
 פן השמחו בני פלשתים
 אך עצב היתה לנו
 ישכב המלך עם אבותיו
 מחמד הוא כל עבוד
 ורעה על לב עמו
 על כן ערבה כל שמחה
 ולח ממוש מארץ
 סגר כל בית מבוא
 פני כלם כבצו פאריר
 ופלגירמים ירדי עינינו
 כן מדר תושכנה כל אנחת
 בי מלכים ימלכו נאם יהוה
 הנה בלר אשר יעצר בעמיו
 ישר בצדק ובמשפט המלכות
 וראתו היתה על פני הגוים

* The Duke of Kent, who died a few days before his Father.

הסודרים לא ירימו את קרנים
 ישכן ישראל לבמה ובשלו
 איש תחת נסנו ותחת תאגרו
 וישאן מפחד המון :

Doncaster.

Inscription to Prince Blucher.

Obiit
 Borussia, Germaniæ, quin universæ Europæ
 Vindex et Heros.
 Mortem unam non fugavit,
 Cui tamen superstes :
 Nam quæ dantur humo, humi sunt,
 Nec non mœrenus nisi absentem Divum.
 Nullum nobis monumentum restituet,
 Qualis erat ;
 Nec ulla unquam historia res ab eo gestas
 Perscriptura est æque,
 Ac ille gessit
 Cui fracto Omnium hoste, bisque servata Patria.
 Nihil amplius esset negotii tantæ virtuti,
 Ne quid humani sibi accideret porro,
 In immortalium demigravit sodalitium.
 Diu multumque discessum Sui graviter feret Germania,
 Tumque demum stabilis videbitur ac prospera,
 Ubi non desiderabit
 Arminium alterum.

Latin Version of a Commandment.

I have heard the late *ὁ πάλυ* Dr. Cyril Jackson repeat the following version of a commandment with such special pleasure, that perhaps it may be worthy of some vacant corner in your Journal.

Dum Jura Amramidi Sinai e vertice montis
 Servanda æternum Jura, Jehovah dabat ;
 "Septima quæque," inquit, "nulli temeranda labore,
 Septima quæque dies, esto, memento, sacra !
 Per reliquas operere, licet : sed septima surgens
 Lux tibi permissi meta laboris erit
 Jumentis tum solve jugum, Famulique quiescant,
 Et quicumque tuis Adibus Hospes adest ;

Omibus una quies esto ! quo me tua conjux,
 Me tua progenies, me tua tota domus
 Solenni de more colat, surgique verendis
 Ritibus, et purâ Religione velit.
 Ipse Ego, rerum ingens opifex ! quum denique sexto
 Fimeram æterno numine cuncta die,
 Ipse Ego, magni operis supremo in fine quiescens
 Divi, sancta esto septima quæque dies !”
 1793. W. W. Ch. Ch.

NOTICE OF

RICARDI PORSONI *Notæ in ARISTOPHANEM, quibus
 Plutum Comadiam, partim ex ejusdem recensione,
 partim e MISS. emendatam, et variis Lectionibus
 instructam præmisit, et Collationum Appendicem
 adjecit PLIRUS PAULUS DOBREF, A. M. Collegii
 SS. Trinitatis Socius. Cantabrigiæ, sumtibus Collegii
 SS. Trin. 1820.*

It is with extreme pleasure that we have to announce a work with the above title. And though our notice of it must be brief, appearing, as it does, towards the close of the month, in which this number is due, we cannot omit the opportunity of congratulating the learned world on the continued publication of the Porsonian papers.

Whatever may have been the surprise of many persons, dead or living, respecting the want of exertions in the members of the University, to rescue their body from the alleged imputation of giving but few proofs of their attachment to the learned languages, and of their slowness in putting their press into requisition, for the publication of works connected with the golden days of Greece and Rome; and whatever may have been the regret, that the funds of the University, small as they are, should have been devoted to purposes, rather of a profitable than honorary kind, the appearance of the present, and other preceding similar publications, proves that such surprise and regret ought to be considerably diminished. And since just complaints repeated, have, as they ought to do, produced an improvement, the happiest auguries may be formed, from the conviction that ardent worshippers are now to be found, *By Giant's sedge banks and cloistered shades.*

Amongst these worshippers of the Classic Minerva, the members of Trinity College have ever held the honorable place of Hierophants. In support of their established character, they have long since favored those out of the pale of their society, with a portion, perhaps the richest, of the fruits of Porson's labors -- And we are now presented with the second course of this intellectual banquet, every way deserving of the dead and living, whose united name it bears.

Of the value set on the *Porson Adversaria*, perhaps the most convincing proof may be given by stating that, almost as soon as it appeared, the work was reprinted in Germany, and such is its favor with the scholars of that country, that one of them has been eager to extract some of the most beautiful emendations of Porson, and to adorn the pages of two pamphlets with a whole host of borrowed discoveries, *that shine like newborn stars midst darkness palpable*. The facts of this second Fiorillo have been putly exposed in two numbers of this Journal. But the whole account of these twin plagiarists is not yet settled. Some items, that have been overlooked, shall be given at a future time, and a statement of debtor and creditor drawn up between Charles James Blomfield and Richard Porson -- On the propensity of the French Fiorillo, a hint has been delicately given before: and we had hoped that C. J. B. would have spared us the pun of *explication*. Plagiarism neglected must bring on annulment. No canon of justice permit us to exhibit the same tenderness of feelings as Kidd and Dobree have shewn to Fiorillo and Memel, a tenderness which, we venture to say, bears no proportion to the severity of their real sentiments in the condonation of this conduct. It is true that the plagiarisms of C. J. B. are not so numerous or obtrusive as those of Fiorillo and Memel, yet the very circumstance of their smaller numbers and greater concealment, (though sufficiently marked, so as to leave not the shadow of doubt) does not, in our estimation, diminish the culpability of the party.

The individual on whom Trinity College has conferred the honorable, though by no means sinecure, office of Editor, is P. P. Dobree. We know not on whom a better choice could have fallen. Of his classical attainments, though well known and duly appreciated within the walls of his own college, and on the Continent, the public in this country have had, till lately, few opportunities of judging. In the communications, however, to his learned friends, and more particularly to Kidd, in his editions of Porson's Miscellaneous Criticisms, and Dawes'

Tisellmer is Criticisms, the name of P. P. Dobree often appears, and generally connected with some facts, indicative of his intimacy with R. P.; and a conviction is generated, that to such a friend Porson himself would have wished, if his papers were to be published, that the publication should be entrusted.

The volume contains a short preface 'The *Plutus* of Aristophanes'; under the text of which are found the notes of Porson and of the Editor—then follow Porson's annotations on the remaining Comedies, and a few of the fragments, succeeded by the Editor's Appendix, containing collations of MSS. and printed books, and last the whole is closed by the Indices.

From the fact of finding elsewhere published with the notes of Porson, the learned world will be tempted to believe that on the remaining plays Porson had also drawn up his remarks, that little would be left to a Editor of Aristophanes, except to model the text according to the presumed ideas of Porson, by examining the sources of emendation pointed out by him. We think it right, however, to warn our readers against fondly indulging in such a fancy.—The truth is, that of the *Plutus* two thirds had been transcribed by Porson, by way of specimen for a new edition, and the Editor has completed this play, in order that the volume might have something to recommend it to others than merely critical readers of *Skeleton Script*.

That this step has been taken, is a subject of great delight, as it has enabled us to extend our knowledge of Greek, by the proofs the Editor has exhibited of his acquaintance with that language.—Some of these proofs we shall extract, accompanied by an observation or two.

On looking over the notes of Porson, we find very few to which any length, a circumstance little surprising to those who are conversant with his brevity of style, even in remarks intended for the public eye—from which conciseness he would not survive, when writing for his private use.—Whether the accident that destroyed, as he himself stated, the labors of twenty years on other authors, was equally fatal to those on Aristophanes, we have no means of ascertaining; nor can such an enquiry lead to any other result than the expression of thankfulness for the escape of some portions of the fruit of those labours from total destruction, and that, though the temple itself,

in all its decorations has perished, yet the scaffolding still remains, by means of which a future Porson may build no mean name as an Editor of Aristophanes. That such a work is a desideratum in literature, the best scholars will most readily ac-

knowledge, not perfectly satisfied by the editions of Kuster, Brunck, and Invernizius. This undertaking, however, is to be achieved, if achieved at all, by the rarest union of labor most continued, mind the most watchful, fancy most quick, and judgment most subdued. In some of these requisite qualifications Porson was rich; and he has exhibited himself to great advantage, by the very careful manner in which he has noted the passages of Aristophanes cited by Suidas, in such a way frequently as to baffle the keenest eye of the most diligent observer. Nor has he been negligent in detecting latent allusions to Aristophanes, to be found in authors of every age of Greek and Roman literature. Much, however, remains still to be done by a future Editor, not only in quotations from existing passages, but in the more difficult task of finding allusions, which are not at present referable to other places, than where *lacunæ* may be proved to exist. Of such *lacunæ* our readers will be surprised to hear that the number is, at least, a hundred; all of which may be supplied from Suidas, and other writers. But, of the existence of these *lacunæ*, though R. P. has given one specimen, yet of the means of supplying that one, he seems not to have been aware, nor of the fact, that a printed work offers a nearer approximation to the lost words of Aristophanes, than those suggested by the conjecture of R. P. In the *Acharneus*. v. 1143, R. P. has proposed an emendation, on which the Editor remarks: "*Nullus dubito poetæ mentem assecutum esse Porsonum; sed verba non prastiterim.*" An observation in which we fully coincide; and hope to be more fortunate in obtaining his assent, while we profess, in the following supplement, drawn from Suidas, to read—

Ἰτε δὲ χαίρουντες ἐπὶ στρατίᾳ
 τῷ μὲν πίνειν στεφανωσμένῳ,
 τῷ δὲ βιγῶν, στέφος αἶθριον,
 τῷ δὲ καθεῦδειν μετὰ παιδίσκης
 Ὀραιοτάτης, τῷ δὲ φυλάττειν
 Ἀνατριβομένῳ ὅτι τὸ δαίνα.

The words of Suidas are Στέφος καὶ στέφη καὶ αἶθρια στέφη τὰ ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων κομιζόμενα ὡς αἰ ἐν ὑπαίθρῳ τιθίμενα. The Comic Lexicon, to which Suidas is here indebted, was transcribed by the compiler of a similar vocabulary, to be found amongst the *Lex. Bekker.* p. 355. Αἶθρια στέφη. Of this passage Mr. Barker seems to have been ignorant, or he would have, probably, corrected στίφη into στέφη in the following article:—
 "Αἶθρια στέφη Suidæ sunt τὰ ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων κομιζόμενα, quod semper sub dio ponantur. Idem Hesych. cum e Cratini Iliadibus

attulisset huius senarium, Ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐ αἰθρία τιμωρίας στίφη
subjungit τε γὰρ Ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐκ ἔστι κατὰ τὴν ταχύνειν ἄγνοτέαν οὐχ
ὕπὸ στέργῳ δ' ἂν ἴσ' αὐτὴν εἰς αὐτὴν αἰτῆται. From this gloss of
Hesychius it may be conjectured that Aristophanes wished to
adulce his great rival's verse, Ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐκ ἔστι τιμωρίας στίφη
for so it ought to be read, as αἰθρία being the contracted form
of αἰρία, has the penultimate long. See Nub. 371 καὶ τοὶ
γὰρ αἰρία εἴπω although we are aware that αἰθρία has
sometimes the penultimate short in which case we might leave
the verse of Cratinus untouched and read in Aristophanes αἰ
θρία εἴπω ἴσ' αὐτὴν, where εἴπω is shortened, as in these
examples αἰαὶ αἰν and αἰαὶ αἰν, in Med. 1081. Fro
dox., and more oppositely, ἡγεῖσθ' αἰν in Nub. 355.

But on this, and indeed any points connected with the παραδρο
μὰς of R. P., it is almost useless to expatiate, removed as
the Author is from the power of correction, and equally useless
would it be to extract any specimens of his δὲ θέρπει, con
victed, as the chosen is that R. P. could not have paid his
attention to a corrupt author like Aristophanes, without giving
proofs of his great critical talents, and little satisfied is even the
most superficial reader must be, without a perusal of the volume
itself. With respect, however, to the Editor himself, a different
line of conduct may be adopted, and we feel we should be want
ing in justice to him did we neglect to call the attention of the
classical scholar to the following notes of P. P. Dobree on
the *Plutus* v. 111. 178. 277. 311. 361. 364. 586. 689. 758.
763. 765. 782. 1001. 1002. 1013. 1161. In all of these we
found a happy union of extensive erudition and delicate
taste, joined with what may be called the τὴν σπουδὴν τῆς τέχνης
τῆς ἐκείνου critic's felicity of emendation. Similar proofs,
valuable to the Editors' talents might be adduced from the
Accharum vi. 300. 323. 639. 1012. Nor are there wanting in
the other plays equal reasons to recommend an early acquisition
of the volume to all who take an interest in the remains of
Aristophanes, and of the other volumes of Greek comedies
in which form are seen—

Just and youthful polliity,
Quips and grunts and wanton wiles,
Noes and becks, and wreathed smiles,
Such as hover on Hebe's cheek,
And lov'd to live in double sleek;
Sport, that wrinkled Care derides,
And Laughter holding both his sides

In enumerating the Editor's annotations, so highly creditable
VOL. XXI. C C H. NO. XLII. A

to his talents, we do not, however, mean to state that in all cases we entirely agree with him; and we beg to suggest the following improvement in the Lyric Fragment, the measure of which he has happily detected in the Addenda p. 105

ἡδὺ μέλις Ἀνακρέων, ἡδὺ μέλις, Σαπφώ.
 Πινδαρικὸν δέ μοι μέλος συγκεράσας τις ἔγχει.
 Τὰ τρία ταῦτα μοι δοκεῖ καὶ Διόνυσος ἔλκων
 χ' ἅ Παφίη λιπαρόχροος, κεί τις, Ἐρως πιεῖν ἄν.

The Palatine Ms. is resorted to by Fischer, in his *Anacreon*, p. 239, to exhibit the fragment in this fashion—

ἡδυμελὴς Ἀνακρέων
 ἡδυμελὴς δὲ Σαπφώ
 Πινδαρικὸν τὸδε μοι μέλος
 συγκεράσας τις ἔγχει
 τὰ τρία ταῦτά μοι δοκεῖ
 καὶ Διόνυσος εἰσελθὼν
 καὶ Παφίη λιπαρόχροος
 καὶ αὐτὸς Ἐρῶς ἄν ἐπιείν.

We doubt, however, about εἰσελθὼν; and suspect that the reading was originally ^{εἰς} ἐλκων. From which ἔλκων is easily attainable, by a mistake very common, of confounding *ic* and *x*, See Dobree Addend. p. 241, 2. Concerning the use of ἔλκειν, *poculum haurire*, we remember to have seen somewhere the phrase ἔλκων ἀμύστει, though the identical passage is not at hand. We cannot be led to think that Παφίη without the article means *Venus*, nor to believe that there is any beauty in the expression αὐτὸς Ἐρως, *Love himself*; and unless we err egregiously, we are almost sure the Ms. reads ^{αν} _{σπειν} : where the *c* at the end of Ἐρως gave rise to the *ε* at the beginning of *επιείν*.

We cannot conclude this brief notice of the Porsoniana, without extracting one most happy specimen of P. P. Dobree's initiation into the mysteries of conjectural criticism. It is well known that a very long fragment of Euripides has been preserved in the oration of Lysurgus against Leocrates; and amongst other corrupt and difficult passages, the following is found, thus exhibited in the editio princeps. Οὐδ' ἂν τελείας χρυσέας τε γοργόνος Τρίαιναν ὑβθὴν στᾶσαν ἐν πόλεως βάθροις Εὐμολπος οὐδ' Ἰθάξ ἀναστήσει. λεῶς Στεφάνοισιν οὐδαμῶς τιμῆσεται. *Sed præclare*, says Mr. Dobree, Codex Cripsio-Burneianus, (a most precious document, which, thanks to the liberality of Parliament, is now deposited in the British Museum) *στεφάνοισι*

πάλλας δὲ οὐδαμοῦ τιμῆσεται. *Quare partim assumtis Valckenaeri et Musgravi emendationibus lege* Οὐκ ἔσθ' ἐκούσης τῆς ἐμῆς ψυχῆς, ἄνερ, Προγόνων παλαιὰ θέσμι' ὅστις ἐκβαλεῖ Οὐδ' ἄντ' ἐλάας χρυσείας τε Γοργόνος Τρίαιναν ὀρθὴν σταῖσαν ἐν πόλεως βάθροις Εὐμολπος οὐδὲ Θράξ ἀναστέψει λεωὶ Στεφάνοισι, Πάλλας δ' οὐδαμοῦ τιμῆσεται. "*Nunquam committam ut Eumolpus Athenarum tutelam Palladi Poliadi ademtam patri suo Neptuno tribuat. De ἐλάας et τριαινῇ in Acropoli vide quos citat Meursius Cecrop. xviii—xvii.*

Amongst the novelties of this work, we observe, by the collation of an edition in the possession of the Editor's learned friend, George Burges, that in some Mss. of Aristophanes, the Scholia, hitherto wanting upon the Thesmophoriazusa, are, or at least were, not long since, to be found. But we regret to add, that these Scholia, which are of a high order, do not extend beyond the 276th verse.

We are pleased to perceive that, with the exception of Meineke, and men of his stamp, the Editor has spoken of contemporary scholars in language, preserving an honorable medium between the extravagance of flattery, and the niggardness of praise. As it has ever been our wish to see all the lovers of Greek literature united in a bond of union worthy of the good cause, and of the party espousing it, we will extract the close of the Editor's preface :

"Transmisit vir eximius, et de me optime meritus, J. F. Boissonadius, notulas in Plutum, extemporales quidem illas, at se dignissimas, quas in Appendice invenies. Neque silentio prætereundus Georgius Burges, vetus et probatus amicus, qui multa e codicibus excerpsit, et alia docte, ut solet, et utiliter admonuit."

We feel ourselves obliged to the Editor for pointing out some errors committed in the transcript of the Mss. Notes of Bentley on Aristophanes; and we take this opportunity of stating that a small supplement of corrections will hereafter be given, and with it some inedited Notes of Jos. Scaliger.

As connected with the publication of the *Porsoniana*, we subjoin the following Notulæ of R. P. transcribed from the margin of a copy of Casaubon's *Athenæus*, once in his possession.

P. 248. E. ἔφησεν ἐπιλανθάνομαι] ἔφη ἵνα μὴ ἐπιλανθάνωμαι : Vide p. 427. F. ἴν', ἔφη, μὴ γνωσθῆς. [Eandem conjectura exstat in *Advers.* p. 87. verum ibi deest locus parallelus.]

P. 269. D. μετ' ἀμνηστῶν καὶ νασίσκων] Delere καὶ νασίσκων voluisse videtur R. P.

P. 269. D. *οπταῖς* omittunt edd. Cas. 2. et 3.

—— D. τὰ δένδρη τ' αὐτοῖς ὄρεσι—φυλλοροήσει] τὰ δὲ δένδρη τὰν τοῖς ὄρεσι—φυλλοχοήσει [Aliter in Advers. p. 90.]

P. 286. D. ἔσθιε μοι] ἔσθε μέσου.

P. 310. E. κούφαν γε λεβῶδη] κουφαττελωβῶδη vel κεφαττελωβῶδη Bentleius in Phalario, p. 86=62. Prius verum, alterum nimis subtile. [Nempe voluit Bentl. κοῦφ' ἀττελεβῶδη, vel, una voce κεφαττελεβῶδη.]

P. 499. C. εἶρεικε τὸν λάγυνόν τινες τρίχουν] τριχοῖ. [Non intelligi satis bene potest Porsoni μην.]

P. 581. D. καθιππάσαι] καθιππάσασθαι.

E. ἔπει τ' ἐνείπειν] ἔπειτεν εἰπεῖν ἐδόκει μαζὸν] ἐδοκίμαζον.

Literary Intelligence.

NOVUM Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, ob frequentes omnium Interpretationum hallucinationes, nunc demum ex Codice Alexandrino, adhibitis etiam compluribus Mss. Variantibusque Electionibus editis, summa fide ac cura Latine redditum. Omnibus Sacris Auctoribus Græcis, Sacris Criticis, Glossarum, et Instructionibus per totam Græciam Ecclesiasticis Viris, diligentissime consultis. Interprete Leopoldo Sebastiani Romano, Sacrarum Missionum in Persiâ quondam Præfecto. Royal 8vo. Rivington, London.

The learned Author is well known to the classical world. His Edition of Lycophron, in 1803, ranks him high among the editors of the Classics; and his translation of the Gospels into Persian, printed at Calcutta in 1813, distinguishes him as an Oriental Scholar. His various travels, and the account of his connexion with this country, detailed in the Preface, are interesting in a political and literary point of view. To give an idea of this translation, we insert the beginning of the Acts, which may be compared with the Vulgate, and the versions of Beza and Castalio.

GESTA SANCTORUM APOSTOLORUM.

CAPUT I. — *Jesus promittit Apostolis Spiritum Sanctum, et ascendit in cælum: post preces acriter eligitur Matthias in locum Judæ proditoris.*

¶ In primo quidem opere egi, o Theophile, de omnibus iis, quæ Jesus fecit et docuit ab initio,

2. Usque ad diem, quo receptus in-cælum-fuit, postquam per Spiritum Sanctum præcepta-dedit apostolis, quos elegerat :

3. Quibus etiam, postquam passus est, compluribus certis-argumentis exhibuit sese viventem, in quadraginta dies versans cum eis, et loquens de iis, quæ *pertinent* ad regnum Dei ;

4. Et veniens-in-eorum-cætum, jussit eos non discidere Hierosolymis, sed *illic* expectare promissionem patris, de qua, *ait*, me audistis-dicentem :

5. Johannes quidem baptizavit aquâ, sed vos inter paucos dies baptizabimini cum Spiritu Sancto.

6. Ii igitur quum convenissent, interrogabant eum, dicentes : domine, an in hoc tempore restituis regnum Israeli ?

7. Sed eis respondit : non est vestrum nosse tempora, temporumve articulos, quorum *rationem* pater reservavit potestati suæ ;

8. Sed accipietis virtutem Spiritûs Sancti, qui veniet super vos ; et eritis mihi testes tum Hierosolymis, tum in tota Judæa ac Samaria, et usque ad extremitatem terræ.

9. Et hæc cum dixisset, illis spectantibus, elevatus est ; et nubes suscepit eum ab oculis eorum.

10. Cumque oculos in cælum, ipso scandente, defixos haberent, ecce, duo viri, albis amicti-vestibus, in eorum conspectu astiterunt :

11. Qui etiam dixerunt *eis* : viri Galilæi, quid intuemini in cælum ? hic Jesus, qui ex vobis assumtus in cælum est, sic veniet, quemadmodum vidistis eum scandentem in cælum."

Novam Systema Ethices, seu Moralis Philosophiæ ex optimis Anglis Auctoribus in Compendium redactum. Studio ac sumptibus Leopoldi Sebastiani. Rome, 1819.

This is a work, by the same author, of great research and considerable merit, in an easy style, and as clearly written as the nature of the subject will allow. It is not, like his Testament printed in England ; but he professes a high admiration of the writers and the character of this country. As a proof of this, we shall quote the conclusion of his Preface.

" Ne turpi otio insuetus marcescerem, cogitavi tractatum de moribus conscribere, et systema, quod cæteris omnibus plausibilius esset, adoptare ; sed hoc scilicet inter Anglos auctores ex sententia nactus, libenter suscepti latinis auribus accommodandum, quapropter, benevole Lector, te rogo, ut quaecumque hujusce opusculi pretium tibi esse videbitur, totum Anglis, solum mihi studium, referre velis. Ciens ista domi et militiæ strenua, æquitate autem regiminis, amore justitiæ, legum observantia, et potissimum philanthropia sua insignis, studio literarum adeo claret, ut plurima scriptorum suorum opera eruditione sententiarumque gravitate admirationi sint."

We are sorry to see this praise qualified by the last sentence :

“ *Utinam hæc semper grata generosaque Natio antiqui mei in se studii bonorumque officiorum meorum, et quomodo tandem in Persia pro sua et justitiæ causa tuenda totius conditionis meæ jacturam fecerim, reminisceretur, quandoquidem spes illa magna, qua nixus biennio ante e Britannia discessi, præcisa esse videtur, non sine datæ acceptæque fidei dedecore.*”

We are not sufficiently informed on the subject to decide on the reasons of his disappointment ; but we think it due to the Administration, and to the India Directors, to insert the conclusion of his Preface to the Testament :

“ *Apologiam meam (Constantinopoli) Romam misi. Rescriptum mihi fuit, S. Congregationem rationes meas æqui bonique consuluisse, et ad jus bonum mihi reddendum paratam esse ; ideoque oportere me Romam petere.*”

“ *Acceptâ epistolâ, statim navem obsequentissimus conscendi, et Genuam trajeci, unde post consummatos in læmocompto quadraginta dies, Romam abii. Sed heu ! pudet dicere, quinque mensibus alto silentio involutum me vidi, et jura mea, meos labores ac sumptus, promerita tandem mea oblivione deleri. Quamobrem statui meliora auspicia tentare, et in Britanniam proficisci, justitiam et æquitatem illius gentis, pro qua tot adversa pertulcam, experturus. Itaque ab urbe profectus, et in Melitam tractus, inde huc Londinum per Tamesim appuli, et paucis diebus post, libellum moderatoribus Societatis Indiarum Orientalium obtuli : qui statim pro eorum æquitate mihi adfuerunt, et ad istud supremum regimen me remiserunt. Retuli igitur rem omnem ad hunc regium pro exteris negotiis ministrum Vicecomitem Lord Castlereagh, qui et animo et genere nobilis, rem meam ad rationem temporum ac conditionis meæ summâ prudentiâ et sagacitate expedivit, simul agente ingenuo atque erudito viro Gulielmo Hamilton. Quamobrem tum ipsis in primis, tum Societatis Indiarum moderatoribus, necnon egregio Comiti Thomæ Elgin, qui pro snâ humanitate semper mihi præsto fuit, debitas rependo grates, et me e Britannia de hujus supremi regiminis æquitate contentum discedere profiteor.*”

*The Enthusiasm of the Methodists and Papists considered ; By Bishop Lavington. With Notes, Introduction, and Appendix. By the Rev. R. Polwhele, Truro. In one large Vol. price 1*l.* 1*s.* 6*d.**

Contents of the Introduction :

“ *Separation of Dissenters from the Church : Character of Dissenters of former times : Methodists of the present Day : Blessed Effects of Methodism on Society : Mischiefs of Sectarism : The Puritans, their successful hostilities against the Church Government : Sectarists of the present day, their rancorous abuse of Bishops :*

Modern Methodists—their obtrusiveness—their promptness in attacking our discourses on public occasions : Their general topic of abuse, that we do not preach the Gospel : Pretences to inspiration : Official importance ; Singing, praying, exhorting, preaching, style, and manner, and doctrine : Methodist Preacher, his familiarity with his flock : Co-operation of Churchmen with Sectarists, the Evangelical Clergy : Extempore Preaching of the Evangelical Clergy : Mrs. H. More : The Blagdon Controversy : Mr. Wilberforce : Clergy and others giving way to Methodists, who circumvent us by Charitable Institutions : Puritans attempting the Universities, present Society : Female Agency : Indifference and false Candour in Churchmen : Qualification of Methodists : Clerical conduct with respect to Dissenters in general : Division of large Parishes, building Churches : Canons and Rubric, to be cleared from ambiguities, and confirmed by a new Statute : Education of the Clergy : Universities, seeds of Sectarism sown there : Intercourse between Dignified and Parochial Clergy : Church Catechism : Mr. Southey : Conduct in our families : &c. &c. &c.”

Two learned men are preparing in Holland new editions of Dion Chrysostomus, and of Apuleius. The latter author will be adorned with the posthumous observations of Oudendorp.

Nouvelles recherches sur l'époque de la Mort d'Alexandre, et sur la Chronologie des Ptolémées ; ou Examen critique de l'Ouvrage de M. CH. . . . F. . . . intitulé Annales des Lagides : par M. J. St. Martin. Paris, 1820. Imprimerie Royale. 8vo.

Translation of Strabo, finished.—To those among our readers who engage in the study of antiquities, especially of ancient geography, it may be interesting to learn that the translation of Strabo, published under the patronage of the French government, is at length brought to a conclusion by the publication of the fifth volume, in quarto, from the Royal press. This work has engaged the talents and learning of MM. de la Porte Duheil, Gosselin, Coray, and Letronne, during several years ; and must be placed among the most eminent of its kind. In going through a performance so extensive and laborious, it is natural that many observations should be made by the learned coadjutors, as well as that much subsequent information should be obtained ; an additional volume may therefore be expected, containing such addenda, with tables of matters, and other illustrations.

The Greek Journal, *‘Hermes Ho Logios,’* for Sept. 1819, contains, among other articles, a memoir, in the form of a letter, of the services rendered during twenty years, to Greece, by the brothers Zosimas—they are both numerous and important. “These worthy and

respectable sons of the country," says the writer, "could no longer endure to see it covered with the shades of ignorance; but concluded that to be rendered happy, it must be enlightened. They have established at Joannina, in Epirus, their native country, a school of the first order, have enriched it with an excellent library, have assigned considerable funds for the emolument of professors, have granted pensions to poor students, and have spared no expense to assist in raising their unfortunate country. To their munificence we owe the Greek Bibliotheca of Mr. Coray, with its excellent commentaries, the fruit of much study and learning. The eldest of the brothers Zosimas has resided from his youth at Moscow. The venerable mother of the Emperor Alexander, being a few years ago in that ancient capital of the Czars, desired to see the benefactor of Greece, caused him to be presented, entered into conversation with him, with distinguished good-will, and among other things said to him—'M. Zosimas, the benefits which you confer every day on your countrymen, are known to my son, and to me: continue them; and assure yourself, that independently of our satisfaction, the blessings of those whom you render happy, will rise even to heaven.' Turning afterwards to the other Greeks who were present, 'Gentlemen,' said she, 'this is the true ornament of your nation.'"

Messrs. Zosimas have formed at Moscow a considerable collection of antiquities, &c. with which they purpose some day to enrich their native country, Greece.

BIBLICAL.

A Vindication of our authorised Translation and Translators of the Bible, and of preceding English versions, authoritatively commended to the notice of those Translators; occasioned by certain objections made by Mr. Bellamy in his translation of the book of Genesis, and by Sir J. B. Burges, in his Reasons in favor of a New Translation of the Holy Scriptures. By the Rev. Henry John Todd, M. A. F. S. A. Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty, and Keeper of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Records. 8vo.

A Reply to the Rev. Mr. Todd's Vindication of our authorised Translation and Translators of the Bible. By Sir James Bland Burges, Bart. 8vo.

Biblical Criticism on the first fourteen Historical Books of the Old Testament: also of the first nine Prophetical Books. By Samuel Horsley, LL.D. F.R.S. F.A.S., late Lord Bishop of St. Asaph. 4 vols. 8vo.

Whatever is connected with Classical or Biblical literature, will receive an accession of strength and interest from Bishop Horsley's writings. Whatever he touches, he turns to gold. These volumes have widely extended the sphere of the critical character of this country. He has not entered into the controversy on the propriety

of the revision of the received translation of the Scriptures. He speaks on that subject with the modest, characteristic of true genius and learning. "With respect to my translation (of Hosea)" says he, "I desire that it may be distinctly understood, that I give it not as one that ought to supersede the use of the Public Translation in the service of the Church." But his Translation of that Prophet, and his Notes on the Books of the Old Testament, accompanied with a new version of many passages, will afford a new argument to the unprejudiced, in favor of the propriety of a revision of the Common Translation. His opinion is, that "if the phrasology of the Bible were not changed from time to time, to keep pace in some degree with the gradual changes of common speech, it would become unintelligible to the common people. With respect to them at this day, the Holy Bible, translated into the English of Chaucer's age, would be a translation out of one dead language into another. Not to say that archaisms, too long retained, instead of raising the style, become in the end mean, and even ludicrous." We shall quote the curious exemplification, which immediately follows: "The book of Psalms would be of little use to the vulgar, if it were translated into the vulgar tongue, after the manner of this specimen: 'Why gnastes the geus, and the peple thoughte ydil thingis? Though the text were accompanied with this luminous comment: 'The prophete, snybband hem that tormentid Crist, saies, whit the geus thoowere the knyttes of Rome that crucified Crist. - gnasted, as bestes with out resoun. and the peple, thoowere the Jews, thoughte vaynte thoughtes' &c. And the tragical story of John the Baptist, so admirably related in all its circumstances by the Evangelist, would not be heard with gravity in any congregation at this day, were the narrative to proceed in this language: 'When the doughtyr of that Herodias was in comyn, and had tombylde and pleside to Harowde, and also to the sittande at mete, the Kynge saies to the wench,' &c. There is a limit, therefore, to the love of archaisms, beyond which it should not be indulged. But there is a limit also to innovation, which I hope I have not passed." Vol. III. p. 301. et seq.

This is the medium, which, in our opinion, should be observed in a new Translation; and this appears to be the principle on which our Correspondent, C. P., proceeds in his Corrections. But man, influenced by party, is the creature of extremes; and we deprecate the violence, and even the existence, of party on a subject, which particularly demands candor and moderation.

An Address from a Clergyman to his Parishioners. Fourth Ed. Containing Morning and Evening Prayers. By R. Valpy, D.D. F.A.S. 4s. 6d. bds.

The Commentaries of Proclus on the *Timæus* of Plato, in Five Books, containing a Treasury of Pythagoric and Platonic Physiology. Translated from the Greek, by Thomas Taylor. 2 Vols. 4to. Price 5*l.* 10*s.*

Greek Grammar; with Notes for the use of those, who have made some Progress in the Language. By R. Valpy, D.D. F.A.S. Seventh Ed. Pr. 6*s.* 6*d.* bds.

New Edition of the *Orphic Classics*; with the *Variorum Notes*. Parts XV. and XVI.

The Volume of Annotations on the *Etymologicum Magnum* as reprinted by Schæfer, which have been partly collected and partly written by Sturz, has recently appeared from the Leipsic Press, and we shall feel ourselves obliged to any of our learned correspondents, who will favor us with a regular notice of this Work. In the 13th page of the Preface, we find the following tribute of praise to our countryman, Mr. E. H. Barker:

“Et primo quidem summis laudibus extollendus est E. H. Barkerus, Anglus eruditissimus, qui subinde, partim Schæfero, partim mihi, sua sponte et solo bonas literas juvandi studio ductus, misit Notas ad *Etym. M.* vel breviores, vel longiores, omnes autem utilissimas, et eximiam doctrinam, qua earum auctorem excellere nemo nescit, denuo ac certissime demonstrantes. Ex his longiores illas, non tamen omnes, post annotationes a me collectas, separatim et uno tenore exhibui ap. 1077. ad 1130. Est hæc præclara hujus viri dos, ut, si quid illustrandum suscepit, id non leviter tangat, sed tamdiu ab omnibus partibus verset, donec nihil obscuritatis remaneat: id quod ille tam *Notis ad Novam Thesauri Græcæ Linguae Stephaniani Editionem*, quam *Dissertatione de voce Ἀνδρείκελοι*, quæ Ill. Fr. A. Wolfii *Analectis Literariis* (V. 1. p. 388—95.) inserta est, aliisque idoneis speciminibus satis superque ostendit. Quare non dubito, omnibus, qui de his rebus judicare didicerunt, operam viri doctissimi egregie præbaturum iri.”

NOTES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

WE understand that an individual, to whom allusion is made in the last No. of this Journal, is displeased with an expression reflect-

ing on the "cavass to check the increase of the list of Subscribers to the *Thesaurus*," and that he wished us to contradict it. If he is disposed to construe that expression as conveying a meaning similar to what is intended in speaking of an election for a Professor's chair in the University, or for a seat in the House of Commons, where the whole bent of the mind and every interest are employed to obtain a particular object, we beg to undeceive him by stating that we meant, by a figurative form of speech, to express strongly an injury, which was deeply felt by the party affected. We are ready to adopt any set of words that may prove less offensive; for we are well assured that the Editors of *Stephens' Thesaurus* are incapable of either malice or revenge, although obliged to defend themselves against the hostility which they have experienced. We again assert, what will not be denied, that the gentleman in question was among the most early and friendly subscribers to the work, and that he refused to receive the first No. What causes he alleged, and what sentiments of opposition he expressed, are well known to many. He cannot surely have forgotten the spirit of his observations; very slight notices might bring it to his recollection. "*Levis exoletum memorem revocat nota.*" We might even appeal to his own candor, whether his expressions were not calculated "to check the increase of the list of Subscribers." Most happy indeed should we be, for the credit of learning, for the honor of human nature, to be enabled to acknowledge that no hostility had been used, or intended. We need scarcely add, that our pages will be open to any observations on the subject.

In the course of a few days will be published, Aristarchus Anti-Blomfieldianus: or a Reply to The Notice of the New Greek *Thesaurus*, inserted in the 44th Number of the Quarterly Review. By E. H. Barker, O.T.N.

• Ἰνῶσει διδάχθεις ὅτι γ' οὐκ τὸ σωφρονεῖν.

• Æsch. Agam. 1434=1398. Blomf.

To which are added the Jena-Reviews of Mr. Blomfield's Callimachus, and of his Edition of the Persæ of Æschylus, translated from the German. Printed for J. H. Bohte, York Street, Covent-Garden.

We are sorry to refuse admission to the article of C. D. We wish to encourage fair and candid criticism; but we must deprecate the attempts of a writer, however elegant his language, and specious his avowed intention, to throw covert insinuations against the faith of our fathers and the religion of our country.

In the same spirit, we shall with the highest gratification accept the Essay of Eusebius Devoniensis.

On s'empresseira de publier l'examen critique de la Table, d'après le cule, de M. Ouvaroff.

With this No. is published a general INDEX to the first Forty Numbers of this Journal, which will of course bind up at the end of the Twentieth Volume. The Index No. will also be found useful for Libraries, as a *work of Reference*.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE.

"*Sum cuique*.—I learn, to my astonishment, from many quarters that the Edition of the series of Greek Authors, which is publishing by Tauchnitz at Leipsig, is even now ascribed to me, not only by several private notices, but also in the public prints, as recently in the instance of Strabo. That I may not appropriate to myself a merit, which does not belong to me, I hereby declare that I have not for *several years* past had the smallest concern in this series.

Professor G. H. Schaefer."

"Leipsig, May 9, 1823."

END OF NO. XLII.
